The Variants in the Gospel Reports

The Alexander Robertson Lectures for 1917

The Variants in the Gospel Reports

BY

T. H. WEIR, B.D., M.R.A.S.
LECTURER IN ARABIC IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

WITH PREFATORY NOTE BY
THE REV. PROFESSOR MILLIGAN, D.D.

PAISLEY: ALEXANDER GARDNER
Publisher by Appointment to the late Queen Victoria
1920

"*Go, litill tretise, nakit of eloquence,*
Causing simpless and pouertee to wit,
And pray the reder to have pacience
Of thy defaute, and to supporten it,
Of his gudnesse thy brukilnesse to knytt,
And his tung for to ruele and to stere,
That thy defautis helit may bene here."

HUNC LIBELLUM

MAGISTRO DISCIPULUS

Dedicat

GULIELMO STEWART THOMAS H. WEIR

VIRO ET DOCTRINA ET EGREGIA

IN OMNIA VITAE OFFICIA

FIDE

MEMORABILI

PREFATORY NOTE

My friend, Mr. Weir, has asked me to write a brief foreword to his Robertson Lectures on *The Variants in the Gospel Reports*. Any such introduction seems unnecessary, but I am glad to have this opportunity of commending to the earnest attention of Biblical students Mr. Weir's careful and learned inquiry. The subject with which it deals is not only full of interest in itself, but is of great importance for the proper understanding of what must ever be for us the leading documents of our Christian Faith; and any light that can be thrown on the manner of their composition, or upon the underlying sources of which, in their turn, the original writers made use, cannot but be welcome.

Mr. Weir's main theme is that the first three Gospels, at any rate, go back to an original Hebrew Gospel, and that the variations in their reports are largely due to their being different translations of this Hebrew or Aramaic text.

How far Mr. Weir has succeeded in establishing his thesis may well be matter of discussion, but there can be no doubt that he has provided a large amount of illustrative material, and in new and unexpected ways has shown how many of the

discrepancies and differences in the Gospel records may have arisen.

The book comes at a very appropriate time, when there is undoubted danger lest the romantic discoveries in the Common Greek of the period, in which the New Testament has come down to us, should lead us to forget the Jewish upbringing of its writers, and the consequently Semitic mode of thought and imagery of which they made use.

Had Mr. Weir done nothing else than this, he would have deserved our gratitude. But, as it is, he has in addition, as already hinted, made a distinct contribution towards the solution of many undoubted difficulties, and I cordially wish for his volume the welcome it deserves.

G. MILLIGAN.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW,
October, 1920.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

My first duty is to express my thanks to the Principal, Sir Donald MacAlister, K.C.B., and the Professors of the Divinity Faculty for putting my name before the University Court as Alexander Robertson Lecturer, and to the Court for making the appointment. I have also to thank the Rev. James Hastings, D.D., the Rev. Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D., and the Rev. Hewlett Johnson, M.A., B.Sc., B.D., for leave to reprint material which had appeared in *The Expository Times*, *The Expositor*, and *The Interpreter*, of which permission I have made full use in the last two lectures.

The text of the Gospels which has been used in these lectures is that published by Dr. Colin Campbell, *The First Three Gospels in Greek, arranged in Parallel Columns*, first edition, Glasgow, 1882.

I have also to acknowledge my indebtedness to the composer of the Dedication, who prefers to remain unnamed; and, lastly, I must thank the Printers for the interest they have shown in setting up an awkward text. I have only to add that,

without the counsel and encouragement of PROFESSOR MILLIGAN, this little book would not have been written.

THE founder of the present course of lectures was born in the year 1833. He matriculated in William Ramsay's Latin Class in 1850 along with Edward Caird, and is described in the late Registrar, Mr. Innes Addison's "Matriculation Albums" as "Alex. Robertson, fil. natu tert. Davidis Mercatoris Glasguensis." He became a licentiate of the Free Church, and, never having been elected to a charge, so remained. He died at 527 Great Western Road in 1899. One of his hobbies would seem to have been purchasing old books in the second-hand bookshops or from the street barrows. In this line, to judge from the volumes which are preserved in the gallery of the University Library, he seems to have been for the most part "a snapper-up of unconsidered trifles."

Mr. Robertson founded the lectures, it is said, on the advice of the late librarian, Mr. James Lymburn, and of Mr. Dalgety, a former well-known minister of the Church of Scotland in Paisley. The lectures are to be "in defence of the Christian Religion." It is not necessary to suppose that Mr. Robertson thought that the Christian religion needed defending, or that it would be possible to find anyone who was in a position to defend it if it did. A curious feature of the

Christian faith as contrasted with other faiths is that its adherents are always ready to accept everything that can be said against it, for the very reason that they do not wish to do so. A certain liking for fairplay and a sporting desire to give one's opponent every advantage have often led to the acceptance of views opposed to one's real convictions. It is difficult otherwise to account for the widespread acceptance in this country of the results of modern criticism of the Old Testament. At the present moment there is going on in England a considerable Mohammedan propaganda which is finding adherents, perhaps on the same principle. The present course of lectures might have been devoted to either of these topics, and I cannot help feeling that it is a presumptuous thing in one who has not, like many, made a life-long study of the New Testament to venture upon the present discussion. In a paper, however, which was read before the Congress of the Society for Biblical Study, held in this University a few years ago, one of the speakers mentioned a Jewish friend who laid it down as a fixed principle that if you wished to make your fortune, the first thing to do was always to keep at least £100,000 free on deposit at your banker's, and he went on to say that, if you wish to understand the New Testament in Greek, the thing to do is to keep a Hebrew Rabbi always at your elbow. It is now becoming more and more recognized that in order to get at

the exact sense of the sayings of Jesus, or even of St. Paul, it is necessary first of all to turn them into Hebrew, because, whatever the New Testament authors may have written or even spoken in Greek, they were always thinking in Hebrew, or, to speak more strictly, in Aramaic, just as it is evident that those who translated the Hebrew Bible into Greek are always thinking in Aramaic also. From this point of view, it is hoped that the present course of lectures, if such they may be called, will be acceptable as one of those "unconsidered trifles" which the founder of the lectureship would not have altogether despised.

T. H. W.

CONTENTS

The Variants in the Gospel Reports

LECTURE I

The Four Gospels—their mutual relation—various theories—Erasmus—revised editions—English Revised Version—the Authorised Version—the Codex Bezæ—three types of text—evidence of papyri.

OUR knowledge of the life and words of Jesus of Nazareth comes almost wholly from four small books, none of which is longer than an article in one of the monthly reviews. There are also short notices and sayings in the Acts of the Apostles and in St. Paul's epistles, and in the few *Logia* or Sayings found in Egypt. The fourth Gospel stands by itself. It differs from the first three in its pictures of Jesus much as the *Dialogues* of Plato differ from the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon in their portraiture of Socrates. It takes up Jesus' relation to the intellectuals of His time and place, while the other three deal with His relations with the common people. Putting aside the last week, it has only two episodes in common with these—the feeding of the 5,000 and the walking on the lake (vi., 1-21). How far the three cover the same

ground will be seen from the following figures: If we divide the whole of the matter into 88 sections, 43 of these will be found in each one of the first three Gospels, 14 in both Matthew and Luke but not in Mark, 12 in Matthew and Mark but not in Luke, 5 in Mark and Luke but not in Matthew, 5 in Matthew alone, 9 in Luke alone, and none in Mark alone. Indeed, of the 661 verses in Mark, 600 are met with in Matthew or Luke.

But not only is the matter largely the same in the three Gospels, but it is often expressed in the same words, as if one writer had copied the other. The sermon of John the Baptist in Matthew (iii., 7-10) is almost letter for letter the same as in Luke (iii., 7-9); and this occurs over and over again in many other places, longer or shorter, sometimes all three agreeing verbally to a greater or less extent. *Cf.* Matthew viii., 9f. and Luke vii., 8f.: Matthew xi., 21 and Luke x., 13: Matthew xii., 41f. and Luke xi., 31f.: Matthew xv., 4 and Mark vii., 10: Matthew xv., 32 and Mark viii., 2, etc.

On the other hand, there are passages, such as the healing of the withered hand (Mt. xii., 9: Mk. iii., 1: Lk. vi., 6), in which each author tells his story in his own way. Then, again, the same events are sometimes told in different order, as the story of the Temptation in Matthew and Luke. Sometimes one almost thinks that one of the books had been let fall and the leaves picked up and put

together in the wrong places—an accident which has actually befallen one of the Papyrus books discovered within recent years. The most interesting cases, however, are those in which a verse occurs *verbatim* the same in two gospels with the exception of a single expression, because then the divergence can be most readily pronounced soluble or insoluble. For example, the sentences, "But if I by Beelzebub . . . come nigh unto you" occur letter for letter the same in Matthew (xii., 27f.) and Luke (xi., 19f.), even down to the phrase "kingdom of God," but for "spirit" Luke has "finger."

Such facts show that the three Gospels concerned are not of independent authorship. Two of them used the third, or else all three used a fourth lost gospel. The question naturally arose, Which of the three, if there were only three, was the first, which second, and which third? Clearly this question can be answered in six different ways, and each of these ways has been upheld at some time by some scholar. Students of this University who learned their Biblical Criticism a generation ago from the late Professor William Stewart, are most familiar with the opinion of J. J. Griesbach, that Mark used Matthew and Luke; but to-day the common view is that Mark and a lost source are the original. The purpose of the following lectures, if such they can be called, is to show how some of the variants in the reports

of the sayings of Jesus in the Gospels may have arisen, and also to show that the variant reports are in a way more valuable than those in which the Gospels are in exact verbal agreement, because by means of these differences we may hope to get back behind our present texts to what was the first Gospel of all.

To most people in this country and America the Bible means the Authorized English Version. Except for small changes in spelling introduced by the printers, this takes us back to the year 1611. The English Authorized Version was based, as the address to the reader states, on "the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the Greek of the New." The Greek text referred to was that of the only editions in use at the time and for long after, which the Elzevirs named in 1633 the *Textus Receptus*. All these editions of the Greek New Testament, from the invention of printing to within a hundred years ago, we may take to go back to the first edition of Erasmus of 1516. In such haste was this last text issued that, from the proposal of the publisher, John Froben of Basle, to its appearance, only four months elapsed. "*Precipitatus fuit verius quam editus.*" It contained, it is said, 500 errors, 400 of which were put right in the second edition and some fresh ones introduced, but it remained the standard text of the New Testament for over 300 years. The edition of Erasmus is based on three MSS. which happened

to be in the library at Basle, where they may still be seen. For the Apocalypse, however, Erasmus used one MS. only, which he borrowed from John Reuchlin. As it was defective at the end, Erasmus translated the last six verses for himself from the Latin. The whole of these MSS. were late cursives ranging from the eleventh to the fifteenth century.

With all its defects, however, the text of Erasmus, at least in so far as the Gospels are concerned, takes us back at once to the beginning of the fifth century, for it is the same type of text as is found in one of the old MSS. of the Greek Bible, the Codex Alexandrinus.

For near three hundred years, however, a certain dissatisfaction has been felt in regard to the MS. authority on which the *Textus Receptus* was based, but for the first two hundred of these the work consisted mainly in the accumulation of material, and the editions of the text printed were largely re-issues of the *Textus Receptus* with increased apparatus criticus. It was not until 1831 that an edition appeared, edited by Karl Lachmann, which threw overboard the *Textus Receptus* altogether, and brought forth an entirely new text founded upon the authority of the best MSS. Lachmann was followed by Tischendorf, who published no less than eight editions of the New Testament in Greek, and Tischendorf by Westcott and Hort, whose text has long held the field in this country. The latest text, however, is that of H. von Soden,

published in Goettingen in 1913. The position in it does not greatly differ from that of Westcott and Hort. The attitude taken up by Dr. Hort in the introduction, written by him and acquiesced in by Bishop Westcott, was that the Greek *Textus Receptus*, upon which our Authorized Version is based, does not go back beyond St. Chrysostom, that is, it dates from the close of the fourth century. From that time on, it is the common text, but before that it did not exist as a text. It is founded upon a great mass of late cursive MSS., together with a few old copies written in capital letters. Dr. Hort therefore rejects it and goes back to the text of the most ancient codices of all. These are the Codex Sinaiticus (א) and the Codex Vaticanus (B), belonging to the middle of the fourth century. Dr. Hort pins his faith to the latter just as Tischendorf had pinned his to the Sinaitic. Wherever the Vatican MS. is available, and there is no reason for suspecting it, its reading is accepted and that of every other MS. rejected. This MS. is admitted by almost all scholars to be the best MS. of the Bible in Greek, outweighing in authority all others.

The English Revised Version of the New Testament appeared in May, 1881, its preface being dated 11th November, 1880. The Greek edition of Westcott and Hort did not appear until the end of the former year, but the revisers were supplied with advanced sheets and were largely guided in

their work by the editors of the Greek text. The Revised Version is in fact practically a translation of Codex B, just as the Authorized Version may in the Gospels and Acts be regarded as a translation of A, as far as it goes. The divergences between the *Textus Receptus* and Codex B will be seen by comparing the English Authorized Version and Revised Version in the following passages: Mt i., 25: v., 44: vi., 13: xvii., 21: xviii., 11 (*cf.* Lk. xix., 10); xix., 17: xxvii., 49 margin; Mk. vi., 20: ix., 44, 46, 49: xvi., 9 margin; Lk. ii., 14: v., 1: xi., 2-4: xxiii., 45: xxiv., 51 margin; Jn. v., 3, 4: vi., 69.

The publication of the Revised Version naturally divided scholars into two camps. The redoubtable Dean Burgon of Chichester came forward as the champion of the old version and the text upon which it was based. The case for the new is stated in Dr. Hort's introduction to the text of Westcott and Hort. On reading through this volume, one cannot help feeling that it is not an absolutely judicial statement of facts. Even those who accept Dr. Hort's conclusions remark that he regards the readings of the *Textus Receptus* not only with dislike, but with absolute contempt; and the absolute supremacy which he assigns to the Vatican Codex can only be regarded as an extreme position. It may be said that Dean Burgon's "Revision Revised" is also biased in the opposite direction. To Dean Burgon, however, is due the

credit of having been the first to set about making an exhaustive collection of the citations from the New Testament, found in the early Church fathers, with the view of rebutting Dr. Hort's assertion that the readings of the *Textus Receptus* are not to be found before Chrysostom. The index thus formed fills sixteen large MS. volumes in the British Museum. Burgon died in 1888. His labour was to a certain extent lost, for the reason that the edition of the fathers which he used, that of Migne, is based upon late MSS. In fact, critical editions are only appearing now, the Latin at Vienna and the Greek at Leipzig. The difficulty about the appeal to the Fathers is that one never knows whether they meant their quotations to be *verbatim* or not. The earlier the authority, the freer the quotation. But the general result may be stated as follows: the Gospel quotations in Clement of Rome, in the Epistle of Barnabas, in the "Shepherd" of Hermas, in Ignatius, and in Polycarp are too free and too slight to point one way or the other. It is not until we come to Origen of Cæsarea (d., 253 A.D.) that the tide begins to turn in favour of the Codex Vaticanus; and, as has been said, from Chrysostom on, the text used is the *Textus Receptus*. But before Origen, that is, from the middle of the second to the beginning of the third century, the text met with is neither that of the Codex Vaticanus nor that of the *Textus Receptus*, but a text differing from both, which is

also found in a sixth century MS. of the Gospels and Acts called the Codex Bezae (D).

This codex differs from all other copies of the Gospels known to exist up to the present time. Perhaps the most notable divergence is the insertion after Luke vi., 4 of the verse, "The same day he beheld a man working on the sabbath, and said to him: Man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, blessed art thou; but if thou knowest not, cursed art thou, and a transgressor of the law." The writer of this codex is fond of putting another word for that used in the other copies, for example, "God" for "Lord" and "Lord" for "God," and so on. This has been explained as due to translation from a Syriac original; but as D differs from the other three MSS. just as the first three Gospels differ from one another, where we get synonymous words in parallel passages, both differences are probably to be explained by the same cause. The order of the Gospels in this MS. is Matthew, John, Luke, Mark—the order of the western Church, and it is accompanied by a Latin version.

There are thus three types of text in the Greek New Testament—that of the MSS. upon which the English Authorized Version is based, that is, nearly all the cursive and late MSS. together with a few uncials, especially A in the Gospels and Acts: that on which the English Revised Version is based, namely, the oldest uncials: and that of which the representative is the Codex D in the Gospels and

Acts. To the last type belong also the Old Latin versions before the Vulgate, and the Old Syriac. It is this type of text which is found in the earliest Church fathers whose quotations can be differentiated, that is, in the middle of the second century. This preference, if it can be so called, becomes more decided in Justin Martyr, Tatian, and Marcion, and still more in Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria. Dr. Hort says: "At all events, when every allowance has been made for possible individual licence, the text of D presents a truer image of the form in which the Gospels and Acts were most widely read in the third, and probably a great part of the second century than any other extant Greek MS. [p. 149]: it is to the best of our belief substantially a Western text of the Cent. II., with occasional readings probably due to Cent. IV. [p. 148]: it is remarkable how frequently the discovery of fresh evidence, especially Old Latin evidence, supplies a second authority for readings in which D had hitherto stood alone [p. 149]."

As the evidence as to the true text of the Gospels to be obtained from the writings of the Church Fathers is not what one would expect, one turns with better hope to the Papyri. These, at any rate, have the advantage that they are, many of them, of the nature of autographs, and are in any case older than our oldest MSS. If we take the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, edited by Drs. Grenfell and

Hunt, in No. 2, a fragment of the oldest known MS. of the New Testament, containing parts of the first chapter of Matthew, the type of text is that which lies behind the English Revised rather than the Authorized Version (Pt. I., p. 7 top). No. 3, however, of about 500 A.D. (vellum), containing Mark x., 50, 51, and xi., 11, 12, exhibits the opposite or A type of text. No. 208, again, of the third century, containing parts of John, conforms to the Codex Sinaiticus, as also does perhaps No. 401 (end of Matthew i. and beginning of ii.) of about 500 A.D. (vellum). On the other hand, No. 405, of about the year 200, and so perhaps the oldest Christian fragment discovered till then, does not agree with the text of Westcott and Hort. In Matthew iii., 17, it probably read, "Thou art" instead of "This is my beloved son." The former is the reading of the Codex Bezae. A reading of the same MS. (Luke xi., 52) is found in No. 655, "Ye have hidden the key of knowledge" for "Ye have taken away," but it ends, "but to those entering ye opened not." No. 845, Pss. lxviii. and lxx., of about 400 A.D., shows an "independent text." The text of others is of a "mixed" type (1075, 2352, 1353), and many have readings elsewhere found only in late cursive MSS. (1007, 1166, 1168, 1226, etc.). Others have readings peculiar to themselves. No. 1007 has two Z's with a horizontal bar through them to represent the usual Hebrew contraction for the

Divine name instead of "the Lord." No. 654, Logion iv., corresponding to Luke xii., 2, etc., has "There is nothing hid which shall not be made manifest, nor *buried* which shall not be (raised up *or* known?)." The Old Latin fragment, No. 1073, in Genesis vi., 2, for the usual "*quod essent pulchrae,*" has *quia speciosae sunt,* a reading mentioned elsewhere. One may, indeed, say of these papyri as a whole what Drs. Grenfell and Hunt say of No. 1007: "As usual, it evinces no pronounced affinities with any of the chief extant MSS., but agrees here with one, there with another. In two passages, again, it sides with some of the cursives against the earlier MS. evidence."

In the Catalogue, again, of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library at Manchester, vol. i., edited by Dr. A. S. Hunt:—No. 1, a fragment of Deuteronomy ii., 37 to iii., 13, of not later than the year 400 A.D., now agrees with B rather than with A, now with A against B, and once with cursives against uncials (iii., 5, "all *the* cities" for "all these cities"). No. 2, Job i., 15-21: v., 24 to vi., 9, omits the long interpolations of A, and is much nearer to B than to it, but in i., 16, it puts "likewise" before "consumed," with the cursive MS. 147. The fragment is of the sixth or seventh century. No. 4, Romans xii., 3-8, in verse 8 agrees with the Sinaitic against the other uncials. No. 5, Titus i., 11 to ii., 8, has in ii., 7, the

reading " unenvyingness " instead of " uncorruptness," a reading found in no other MS., though it was known to exist.

Amongst the Amherst Papyri, Part II., edited by Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, No. cxc., " The Shepherd " of Hermas agrees with the Athos MS. and the corrector of the Sinaitic as against the first hand of the latter. No. cxciii. (vellum), Proverbs x., 18-29, shows some variants from both A and B. No. vi. (in Part I.), containing parts of Psalms cviii., cxviii., cxxxv., cxxxviii.-cxl., displays an indefinite type of text, but generally reproduces A and the second hand of the Sinaitic as against the original scribe of the latter and against B.

Mitteiss and Wilcken, in their *Grundzuege und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde,* vol I., No. 133, give a Christian Amulet, which includes the whole of the Lord's Prayer. The text is virtually the same as that of St. Matthew's Gospel, except that it omits the words " the kingdom and the power and " of the doxology. As the gospel papyri seem to run closer to St. Luke than to the other two, this would seem to show that the extremely short form in which that prayer is given in our Revised Version in the third Gospel is at any rate not correct. The evidence is all the stronger in this case because of the extreme freedom with which the text of the Bible is often quoted in the early centuries. For example, in the same collection, No. 130, a letter to a bishop, of the fourth century,

cites as Scripture the words, "Blessed are they that have a posterity in Zion," the only text approaching which is Isaiah xxxi., 9, "whose fire is in Zion."

Taken altogether, the verdict of the papyri seems to be that any reading of any type may be ancient.

LECTURE II

Influence of dogma on MSS.—the oldest MSS. and the oldest text—the Syriac versions—the Latin versions—scribal errors—negligible variants—influence of lectionaries—variants that go back to original authors—characteristics of Mark—date of the first Gospel—parallel case of the Korán—aims of the first disciples—the question whether the reports aim at being verbatim—parallel case of the Talmud—difference between the narrative portions and the sayings—the parallel case of the Muslim tradition.

WHEN we remember that all the MSS. which have come down to us were written in times when theological dispute ran high within the Church, it is reasonable to suppose that some of them at least are tinged in the interest of heresy or orthodoxy according to the mental bias of the scribes who wrote them. The two MSS., the Sinaitic and the Vatican, in particular, omit so many expressions in which is involved the Godhead of Jesus—for example, the words "the son of God" in Mark i, 1, in the original text of the former: the word "Lord" in Luke xxiii., 42 (For "He said to Jesus, Lord, remember me," they read "He said, Jesus, remember me."); and in John ix., 35, both MSS., along with D, for "Son of God" have "son of man"—that it has been supposed that they were written in the interest, or under the influence, of the Arian schism.

It was not until the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century, partly as a result of the Mohammedan conquests of Syria, Persia, and North Africa, that the doctrines of the Church can be said to have taken their final form, and it was about the same time that both the canon of the Bible and its text became fixed. From that time on, all MSS. are practically identical. They exhibit the kind of text from which our English Authorized Version was made; but the problem which seems to defy solution is, whether that text already existed in the centuries before the earliest MSS., or was the original text more like that of the Codex Vaticanus? In other words, Is the text of the oldest MSS. the oldest text, or is it not?

A precisely parallel problem presents itself in regard to one of the oldest versions of the New Testament, the Syriac. There were two main Syriac translations of the Gospels, one, that contained in the Syriac version of the whole Bible, both Old Testament and New Testament, which is generally known as the Peshitto, and the Old Testament portion believed to date from the second century, A.D. The extant MSS. of this translation of both Old Testament and New Testament date from about the middle of the fifth century. This version holds the same place in regard to Syriac as the Vulgate of Jerome does to the Latin translations, and it was long regarded as the authoritative Syriac version. Another version was

known to exist, portions of which were published in its original and in a revised form by the Dutch scholar De Dieu and by Pococke, but there was no mystery connected with its birth. The original translation of the whole Bible was made for the Jacobite bishop Philoxenus in the year 508, and the revision in 616. These versions were made and used by the Monophysite portion of the Syrian Church: the Nestorians held to the Peshitto.

In the year 1858, however, a new version of the Gospels in Syriac was published by Dr. W. Cureton, and in 1892 the Scots ladies, Mrs. Lewis and the late Mrs. Gibson, discovered a similar copy of the Gospels in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. These two MSS., the latter of which, being slightly the older, belongs to about the year 400, constitute a second Syriac version in addition to the Peshitto, and the question immediately arises, Which is the original Syriac of the Gospels?

About the year 170 A.D., a Syrian Christian, Tatian, drew up a harmony of the four Gospels, which was either composed in, or immediately translated into Syriac. In the third century it was used in place of the separate Gospels in the churches of Edessa. Early in the fifth century, however, this harmony was abolished, and its place taken by a new Syriac translation of the separate Gospels. Rabbúla, who was Bishop of Edessa from 412 to 435, was foremost in this movement,

which was so thoroughly carried out that no copy of Tatian's harmony in the original has survived. It is now generally agreed that the translation which was made by Rabbúla was nothing else than the Peshitto version. The argument for this is that quotations from the Peshitto are not found before the date of Rabbúla, and that after that nothing else is quoted. Such is the view of Professor Burkitt and of those who had a hand in publishing the Sinai Gospels. On the other hand, Tatian's harmony was not used throughout the whole Syrian Church, and the question has to be answered, What became of the gospels used in the other Churches? If it be answered that they are the Old Syriac, it is pointed out that both the gospels published by Cureton and those discovered by Mrs. Gibson and Mrs. Lewis are specifically named "Separate Gospels," in evident contrast to Tatian's "Mixed Gospels." Moreover the Peshitto is the version accepted by all Syrian Christians.

Precisely the same phenomenon which meets us in the problem of the relative age of the two main types of the Greek MSS., and in the main Syriac versions, meets us for the third time in the case of the Latin versions. Only in this case we have left the realm of conjecture, and stand upon the solid ground of historical fact. Before the end of the second Christian century, the New Testament books had been translated into Latin, probably in Africa, where the Latin language had

not yet been displaced by Greek. As one might almost expect from its place of origin, the texts which have survived show so much variation that it is impossible to regard them as MSS. of one and the same version, and Augustine (354-430) speaks of the "infinite variety" of the Latin translations of his day, and of the best of them as being the "Itala," as if some revision had already been attempted. But the revised version which displaced all the Old Latin translations, and became the authorized Bible of the Roman Church, was that undertaken at the instigation of Pope Damasus (366-384) by St. Jerome, the Vulgate.

We know that the Vulgate of Jerome was later than the old Latin translations of which it was a revision, and it is natural to conclude from analogy that the Peshitto, or Syriac Vulgate, represents a later translation than the Sinai Gospels and Curetonian fragments, and that the Greek MSS. on which our authorized English version is based represent a later type of text than the oldest codices, such as the Vatican and Sinaitic, on which the revised version is founded. The argument, however, is not so conclusive as it seems. The Latin Vulgate was, after all, in the New Testament books, putting aside the four Gospels, practically a selected version of the Old Latin, and the quotations of New Testament texts by the early Fathers appear to show that the type of text with which they were familiar was that of the latter,

rather than of the earlier Greek MSS. The Latin Vulgate and the Syriac Vulgate (supposing the latter to be the work of Rabbúla at the beginning of the fifth century) did not invent new readings, but merely made a selection from the old, and the revisers of those days were in some ways not ill-fitted to make a wise selection.

In trying to arrive at some firm ground in such matters, it is necessary to bear in mind that even editors and critics are human. Each is prone to exalt the MS. or version with which he himself is most closely concerned. Dr. Cureton believed that the Old Syriac text which he discovered and edited in 1848 contained, in the case of the first Gospel at any rate, "the identical terms and expressions which the Apostle himself used" (Introd., p. xciii). Professor Burkitt notes that the same claim had been made as long ago as 1555 on behalf of the Syriac Vulgate by Widmanstadius, who edited the *editio princeps* of that version. Mrs. Lewis, again, to whom is due the honour of discovering the other Old Syriac MS., the Sinai Palimpsest, would place its text before even the Diatessaron of Tatian of 170 A.D., and the Curetonian later than the latter, whilst Professor Burkitt places the Diatessaron first. Tischendorf, again, naturally gave preponderating weight to his discovery, the Codex Sinaiticus, as is evidenced by the wide divergence between his seventh and eighth editions: whilst Dr. Hort

preferred above all the Codex Vaticanus, which he may be said to have "discovered" in the modern sense; and the editor of the new Washington MSS. (Professor Sanders of Michigan) wishes to date them in the fourth rather than in the fifth century. And, considering the front place held among English people for many years by the Vaticanus, the decipherers and editors of the Papyri may have been more apt to notice readings in them agreeing with it rather than with those of more obscure copies.

But while many variant readings in the MSS. are due to the mental bias of the copyist, others again can be put down only to his indifference or even carelessness. How careless these copyists of the Bible MSS. could be comes out much more clearly in the Old Testament than in the New. The English reader of the Bible can see, for instance, that in Leviticus xx., 10, a whole clause has been repeated by mistake; that in Joshua xxii., 34, the name of the altar has dropped out. In I. Chronicles vi., 28 (13), the sons of Samuel are Vashni and Abiah; but "Vashni" is really the Hebrew "and the second." The first-born was Joel. See the Revised Version. In Psalm xxxv., 7, the Hebrew reads literally, "They have spread a pit, their net have they digged." But even more unintelligible than the presence of such glaring errors in the text is the fact that Jewish scholars, such as Rashi, could read their Bibles without

seeing them. Probably the only one of the sacred books of the East that surpasses the Hebrew Bible in its scribal errors is the Korán. Certainly the New Testament lags far behind in this respect. The wonder is, when we consider the number of times that these books were copied, that errors due to carelessness are so few. We are apt to forget that even the oldest MS. is a copy of a copy almost to *n* terms. Thus the Circular Letter to the Church at Smyrna on the martyrdom of Polycarp concludes: "These things Caius rewrote from those of Irenæus (a disciple of Polycarp), who also was a fellow citizen of Irenæus, and I, Socrates, wrote in Corinth, copying from those of Caius. . . And I again, Pionius, wrote them from the before written copy, having carefully searched into them, the blessed Polycarp having manifested them to me through revelation, as I will show below. . ."

Thus Pionius, the scribe of the extant MS. made his copy from that of Socrates, and Socrates his from that of Caius, who transcribed his from the copy belonging to Irenæus; and the latest copyist confesses to having made additions to the MS. off his own bat, these being, as he supposed, revealed to him by the dead saint. One can understand why ancient authors call down imprecations upon those who copy their works amiss (Deuteronomy iv. 2: xii., 32; Proverbs, xxx., 6; Revelation xxii., 18, 19). Irenæus concludes one of his works: "I adjure you that copy this book by our Lord Jesus

Christ . . . that you collate that which you have copied and correct it carefully by this your original, and that you likewise copy this adjuration and insert it in your copy " (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History,* V., 20). But even the original documents were not always free from errors due to carelessness or ignorance. Some of the Papyri which contain sayings of our Lord are full of errors, for example, Oxyrhynchus Papyri, No. 654, is " carelessly written in bad Greek," but it may have been that the scribe was merely illiterate.

Many variants in the Gospels, again, are due to the fact that the copyists or, it may be, the original authors were simply indifferent as to the point at issue. They were not interested. Thus, a very common variation occurs in the mention of *those with whom* Jesus conversed, or to whom His sayings were addressed, whether they were Pharisees or Sadducees or scribes, His own disciples or the multitude. The Sermon on the Mount was spoken, according to one account (Matthew v., 1), to His disciples, according to another (Luke vii., 1) to the multitude. Matthew xxvi., 3 has " elders " where Luke xxii., 2 and Mark xiv., 1 have " scribes ": Matthew ix., 3 and Mark ii., 6 have " certain of the scribes " where Luke v., 21 has " scribes and Pharisees "; and so frequently (*Cf.* Matthew ix., 11: xii., 24: xvi., 6 with the parallel places in Mark and Luke: similarly of John the Baptist, Matthew iii., 7).

Anyone who reads the three first Gospels in parallel columns will see at a glance that it is at the beginnings of sections that the narrative parts most frequently diverge, even when the remaining sentences are in agreement. This may be due to many copies of the Gospels having been in the form of Church lectionaries. Anyone who will take the trouble to compare the lessons, for example, in the Church of England prayer-book will find that in many cases the opening words have been altered to make a better beginning. The Diatessaron would naturally be a fruitful source of such variations.

But, in the last place, many of the variations in the Gospels no doubt go back to the original authors themselves. Each had his own point of view. John was a mystic, Luke a physician, Mark of a pictorial artistic temperament, Matthew a Hebrew. Matthew alone uses the phrase "kingdom of heaven." Luke is obviously writing for those who are not quite *au fait* with things Palestinian, and he constantly changes expressions in order to make things intelligible to his readers (*Cf.* iv., 9, 31: xxiii., 51 with the parallel narratives). To express how early the women came to the sepulchre, he uses a phrase from Plato (xxiv., 1). As a physician, he adds notes of medical, botanical, or other interest (iv., 39: viii., 55: xxi., 29). He accounts for the infatuation of Judas by mental possession (xxii., 3) just as the Chronicler

(I. Chron. xxi., 1) does in the case of David, in which he is followed by John (xiii., 2, 27). On the other hand, *cf.* Luke viii., 6, where he omits details of the seed sprouting on rocky ground, and viii., 43, where he leaves out some reflections upon his own calling.

Mark again is specifically the artist evangelist. Unfortunately, these touches sometimes lead him into error; and it is just the question whether these errors have been put right by the later Matthew and Luke, or whether he is not by way of improving upon these two sources. The facts may be explained in either way, and each hypothesis is good. It often seems as if Mark were "touching up" or editing his sources. Thus, in the story of the feeding of the 5,000, Luke says that Jesus, taking the five loaves and two fishes ". . . brake and gave to his disciples" (ix., 16). Matthew inserts "the loaves" before "to his disciples"; but Mark, noticing apparently that "brake" is appropriate only of loaves, not of fishes, corrects "brake the loaves . . . and the two fishes he divided" (vi., 41). Or, again, in the interview with the rich youth (Mark x., 17ff.), the whole point of the narrative lies in this, that the youth's one failing was covetousness, and Jesus, in reciting to him the commandments, purposely omitted the tenth (Matthew xix., 18: Luke xviii., 20). Mark, noticing this, supplies what is lacking, "Defraud not." Quite often Mark combines the readings of

Matthew and Luke. Thus, Matthew (xxvi., 34) has in the warning to Peter "this night": Luke (xxii., 34) "to-day"; but Mark (xiv., 30) "to-day, this night." Further illustrations of Mark's thus twining together the words of his two fellow-authors will be found at Mark i., 42, "the leprosy went out from him and he was cleansed," from "his leprosy was cleansed" (Matthew viii., 3) and "his leprosy went out from him" (Luke v., 13): Mark xiv., 1, "the passover and the unleavened bread" from "the passover" (Matthew xxvi., 2): and "the feast of the unleavened bread which is called the passover" (Luke xxii., 1); and so frequently. No doubt the same thing may be found in the other two Gospels here and there. Thus we have "the men wondered" (Matthew viii., 27): "they feared with a great fear" (Mark iv., 41); and "they, being afraid, wondered" (Luke viii., 25). Or, again, Luke's "Bethphage and Bethany" (xix., 29) from Matthew xxi., 1 (Bethphage), and Mark xi., 1 (Bethany). But the point is that such "conflate readings" are almost the rule in the case of Mark and rare in the other two. The habit of emending his texts (if such it be) sometimes leads to a pitfall, as it has done since. Perhaps Mark's most serious lapses are to be found at ii., 26 (Abiathar for Ahimelech), vi., 17 (Philip), and x., 12 (wife divorcing her husband).

As to the date at which the, or rather a, gospel

was first written down, it is clear that at the first there would be no purpose in drawing up a formal biography of Jesus. The first Christians, St. Paul among the rest, lived in daily and hourly hope of the second coming of Jesus, the last judgment, and the restitution of all things. Just as the eastern landowner will not plant trees, because he knows that he will not live to use their timber, so there was no motive in setting about a work the execution of which might be interrupted by the end of all things. The first Christians had other things to think about than the handing on of the words and doings of Jesus to a future which they did not expect. One of the early Arabs who took part in the Muslim invasions of Persia, having sold his share in the loot for 1,000 dirhems, was asked why he did not demand a larger sum. He answered that he did not know that there was a number above 1,000. And the reason why we do not possess more lives of Jesus by His disciples is that it never entered their minds that such lives would be wanted.

Even in the case of Mohammed, whose revelations were firmly believed to be the very words of God, no attempt was made to gather them together into a book until, some two years after his death, a very great slaughter of the Muslims in battle gave rise to the apprehension that his words might be irretrievably lost. Then and then only were they formally committed to writing. But when

this came to be done, is was found that the bulk of these sayings had already been scrolled by pious believers upon shoulder blades, flat stones, and palm leaves, as well as in the breasts of men. If this took place among an unlettered people, such as the Arabs of that time were, to preserve the words of "the illiterate prophet," we may be sure that among a well-educated people such as were the Jews of the first century, and in the case of a Prophet who could both read and write, many sayings would be taken down on the spot. The Liblar (*libellarius*), or professional letter-writer (familiar to all who read books about Palestine and the modern East) is a well-known personage in the early parts of the Talmud, and we may be sure that many letters passing between Palestine and Egypt and the West would contain reports of the words of the new Prophet who had arisen, mingled with matters of nearer concern.

We have to recall, moreover, that the first disciples did not think of the Gospel as destined to travel beyond the borders of Palestine, or at any rate of the Jewish faith. And it was only when it began to break through these narrow bounds, and when it was no longer possible for those to whom it made its appeal to come into personal contact with those who had been the companions of Jesus and the witnesses of His words and deeds, that the need for authoritative statements regarding His life and teaching came to be felt. As

in the case of the Korán also, the loss by death at the hands of the enemy, or in the course of nature, of those who knew the facts at first hand, would compel those who survived to commit to some more permanent form than that of oral tradition what they themselves knew. But, so much was there to be told, that well on in the second century we find Polycarp and Papias gathering much by word of mouth which has not come down to us.

A further cause why an authoritative life of Jesus would not be drawn up at once, as is the custom with us, would be that the central point of the Christian faith, as taught by St. Peter and the other apostles, was that Jesus is the Messiah promised by Moses and the prophets to the Jewish race. The proof of this doctrine could be attained only by sheer force of argument. No biography, however full, could meet a tenth of the objections and difficulties which each individual enquirer would bring forward. To such an end a formal life would be of very little use.

At the same time, when we consider that the persecution of the Christians began almost immediately, analogy would lead us to the conclusion that at most only a few years were allowed to elapse before at least the utterances of Jesus were committed to writing. The fact that St. Luke's Gospel is admittedly early, and that St. Matthew's is earlier than St. Luke's, and that a comparison of the reports handed down by these

two points most naturally to their being based upon an Aramaic or Hebrew document used, directly or indirectly, by both, it is plain that this document must have been very early indeed, earlier, in fact, than what is usually reckoned our earliest source, the Letters of St. Paul.

The question naturally presents itself, Did the evangelists really mean to give us the exact words of Jesus? Would it not have been enough from their point of view to give the tenor of His words? Each of these positions is supported by what we find in the texts. In defence of the proposition that the Gospels do not profess to give us the very words, but merely the substance of the sayings, it might be pointed out that so many of those sayings are reported in the four Gospels in different words, even where the sense remains the same. One instance is Matthew ix., 16, "No man putteth a piece of new cloth into an old garment," etc., for which Luke v., 36 has, "No man putteth a patch that he hath torn from a new garment upon an old," etc. Even some of the last words of Jesus are not reported the same in each Gospel. Thus, for "Watch and pray" in Matthew xxvi., 41, and Mark xiv., 38, Luke (xxii., 46) has "Arise and pray." Similarly, Matthew ix., 4ff., compared with Mark ii., 8ff. and Luke v., 22ff. (the case of the paralytic). The words of other *dramatis personæ* are also not reported in identical phrase. The question of the rich youth is in Matthew xix., 16,

" Master, what good thing shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" in Luke xviii., 18, " Good master, having done what, shall I inherit " etc. A further reason for believing that the Gospels do not aim at giving the exact words is that the Semitic languages do not, except rarely, employ the indirect speech, and so, when they quote, as it were, in inverted commas, the words are still not meant to be a direct quotation. In the parable of the two sons, " he said, I will not " might be equally well expressed in English by " he said that he would not."

On the other hand, much may be said in favour of the position that the evangelists *did* mean to report the sayings of Jesus at least exactly as they were uttered. The idea of reporting a speech in any but the words used by the speaker is quite foreign to the Oriental historian's sense of literary honesty. The thought of propagating the spirit by abrogating the letter is one that would never occur to him. Even when Jesus and St. Paul infuse a new life into the utterances of Moses and the Prophets, they keep the old formulæ. Jesus constantly quotes the Old Testament writers in a sense which they never intended, and would not have understood, but He does quote the Old Testament words just as they were written.

The Mosaic institutions being a code of laws, the theologians and lawyers of Israel were bound to pay attention to the exact words in which they

were expressed, just as much as is done in the drafting of bills in Parliament. The whole of the dialectics of the Talmud is based upon the letter of the Law of Moses. The tradition of the elders was the beginning of a system of casuistry comparable only to that of the Jesuits in the time of Pascal, and it all drew in the last resort upon the *ipsissima verba* of the Hebrew Scriptures. One of the most curious of its deductions is the proof-text which Rabban Gamaliel offers to show that the doctrine of the resurrection is taught in the Pentateuch. He appeals to Deuteronomy xxxi., 16: "The Lord said to Moses, Thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, but shalt arise." The expression really is, "this people will arise" (Sanhedrin, 90b). Jesus' proof of the truth of this doctrine from the fact that God is called the God of Abraham, and that He is not the God of the dead but of the living, and that therefore Abraham must be alive, was a piece of Rabbinic logic well suited to those to whom it was addressed. The whole of the Christian Scriptures, and especially perhaps the Epistle to the Hebrews, make constant use of the literal expressions of the older Scriptures in order to prove their argument, and we find St. Paul, when he interprets the name Hagar as a Mount Sinai in Arabia (Galatians iv., 25), as he himself says, allegorizing the written word. An extreme example of this method of interpreting the ancient text occurs in the Epistle of Barnabas,

chapter ix., which makes use of the number of Abraham's fighting men, 318 (Genesis xiv., 14), because that number is represented in Greek letters by TIH, to denote Jesus (IH) and the Cross (T).

But if the literary people of the first and second centuries, both Jews and Christians, set much store by the letter of their sacred writings, no less did they by the utterances of the Rabbins themselves. The sayings of the fathers from the time of Ezra onwards were treasured up with a care little, if at all, less than that bestowed upon holy writ itself. Jesus was one of the Rabbis, even if, like Eleazar ben Hyrcanus two generations later, He stood outside the circle of those who were the interpreters of Moses; and we may be sure that the words which fell from His lips would be gathered with no less care than those of the other Rabbis were. Even the critics of the New Testament who reject all the Gospels and most of the epistles of St. Paul do not deny the authenticity of the sayings of the Rabbis that are transmitted to us in the Talmud. It is not easy to understand the logic of this position, if we reflect that nearly the whole of the New Testament must have been written down within a century of the death of Jesus, whereas not a word of the Talmud was committed to writing for six or seven hundred years after Christ.

The number of sayings of Jesus which are given in the same terms, or almost the same, in the first

three Gospels is very large. Nor is this true of His more studied utterances alone, but even of His casual talk. Instances are:—the words to the Canaanite woman (Matthew xv., 26 and Mark vii., 27): "How many loaves have you?" (Matthew xvi., 34 and Mark viii., 5): the first announcement of the passion (Matthew xvi., 21: Mark viii., 31: and Luke ix., 22): the Christian rule (Matthew xvi., 24: Mark viii., 34: and Luke ix., 23, where "daily" is of doubtful authority): the general principle of the following verse, except that Mark, improving on the other two, adds to "for my sake" the words "and the gospel's." The point to be noted in many of these passages is that while the words ascribed to Jesus are the same in the three accounts, the narratives leading up to them are not so. This would seem to show that the narrators wished to give at least the words of Jesus as they were spoken, but dealt freely with their setting. They were converging streams; it is the quotation of a saying that brings them together.

But it is not only the words of Jesus which are given so carefully in the Gospels. All reports of what other people had said are given with the same apparent effort after accuracy. Instances are:—the disciples' "Why say the scribes that Elias must first come?" (Matthew xvii., 10 and Mark ix., 11): the question of John's disciples, "Art thou he that should come?" etc. (Matthew xi., 3: Luke vii., 19): that of the priests, "By what authority," etc.

(Matthew xxi., 23: Mark xi., 28: Luke xx., 2). Mark alters slightly in his usual style. Casual sayings of Jesus also which are found in the fourth Gospel agree with those of the three:—"It is I, be not afraid" (John vi., 20: Matthew xiv., 27: Mark vi., 50): "The poor ye have with you always" (John xii., 8: Matthew xxvi., 11: Mark xiv., 7): "One of you shall betray me" (John xiii., 21: Matthew xxvi., 21: Mark xiv., 18). And of others:—"Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord" (John xii., 13: Matthew xxi., 9: Mark xi., 9: Luke xix., 38, D).

Some notion of how far the early Christians were concerned about handing down, not merely the purport of Jesus' words, but the very words themselves, may be gathered from a consideration of the parallel case of Islám. Mohammed died in the year 632 A.D., and within two years of his death the whole of the Korán had been collected and committed to writing. It underwent a final revision within twenty years, and the Korán as it existed then is as good as the text of to-day. In addition to the Korán, all the sayings and doings of Mohammed that were remembered were gathered together, and the oldest extant collection of them is that of Málik, son of Anas, a native of Medinah, where he died in the year 795, or 163 years after Mohammed. Every tradition of the prophet is traced through a line of witnesses, stretching from the time of Málik to that of

Mohammed, each having passed on the saying or reminiscence to the one after him, much like "the men of the great synagogue." Later, the study of the Muslim tradition became a science, as did the tradition of the elders with the Jews. Learned men would travel all over the Muslim world in search for traditions of Mohammed and his companions, testing their genuineness according to their lights, and rejecting those which they considered spurious. They lived for the most part in the third century after Mohammed. The best known of them is the great Bukhári, who spent sixteen years visiting different countries, during which he heard of 600,000 traditions of Mohammed, from which he chose 7,275 as authentic. He died in the year 869 A.D. He occupies in Islám much the same position as Origen does in the Christian Church. Each was concerned about getting at the very words of the founder of his faith.

Among the first Muslims it was nearness to Mohammed that counted. On that and the date of his conversion to Islám hung his social position and the value of his stipend from the State. A similar criterion existed in the Christian Church. St. Paul rested his claim to apostolic rank upon the vision which he saw on the way to Damascus. When the generation who had "known Christ after the flesh" had passed away, their place was taken by the presbyters who had known the apostles. Papias (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History,* III., 39)

tells that he made it the business of his life, whenever he fell in with any who had spoken with the apostles, to ask them to repeat to him any sayings of theirs which they had heard, holding that the information to be gleaned from written books was not of so great value as that taken down from the lips of those who had heard it uttered. The daughters of Philip (the apostle or the evangelist) were a main source of this knowledge, much as Aishah was in the Muslim tradition. Polycarp of Smyrna also, like Papias of Hierapolis, owes much of his importance to his link with the apostles. Irenæus, again, in his letter to Florinus against heresies which had appeared at Rome, appeals to the doctrine handed down by the presbyters who were the immediate disciples of the apostles (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History,* V., 20). He mentions the vivid recollection he retained of the appearance of Polycarp, whose doctrine he had carefully noted down, not on paper, but on the tablets of his memory. St. Luke also bases his narrative on the evidence of eye-witnesses, whether written or oral. And already in the fourth Gospel we find the exact words of Jesus being used as a text on which to base a commentary (John xxi., 23: Jesus did not say that he would not die, but "If I will," etc.).

How deep is the pious oriental's veneration for the past, especially for the bygone ages of his faith, is shown by an incident which has some interest

at the present time. In the year 1119, in the reign of King Baldwin II., a part of the Cave of Machpelah in Hebron had given way, and a number of the Crusaders going in saw Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, their shrouds having fallen to pieces, lying propped up against a wall, with their heads uncovered. The King ordered new shrouds to be provided and the cave built up again. A certain Ali of Herat, who had written in 1173 a description of the holy places in Palestine, of which a copy is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, speaks of this incident. He says: "The knight Babun who lived in Bethlehem, and held a high position among the Franks on account of his knightly deeds and valour, related to me that he had entered this cave with his father. And he saw Abraham, the friend of God, and Isaac and Jacob —peace be unto them—and their heads were uncovered. Now I said to him, What was thine age at that time? and he answered, Thirteen years. Next he told me that the knight Geofrey, son of Jarj, was one of those whom the king had commissioned to renew the patriarchs' garments, and to rebuild such of the church as had fallen down, and that this Geofrey was still alive. So I enquired after him, but was told that he had died a short time before. Now I, Ali of Herat, do say, verily and of a truth, I myself have seen one who has looked upon Abraham and Isaac and Jacob

—peace be upon them all."[1] The interest taken in this country in an old person who may have known some one who knew Sir Walter Scott or Robert Burns is a small thing compared to the deep awe with which the pious Eastern comes in touch with his own religious past.

[1] Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, p. 317 f.

LECTURE III

Attempts at harmonising by the copyists—Old Testament citations—the parallel of the Greek translations of the Old Testament—arguments against a Hebrew source for the Gospels—absence of some Hebrew idioms—un-Hebrew words in the vocabulary—their dependence for words on II. Maccabees—arguments for a Hebrew source—statements of Church Fathers—post-Biblical Hebrew literature—the Hebrew Apochrypha and Pseudepigrapha—internal evidence of the Gospels—meaning of "Hebrew" in New Testament—dialects of Hebrew—Galilean—the Hebrew of the Mishnah—Aramaic—note on the Greek versions to Daniel.

IN attempting to solve the problem of the inter-dependence of the first three Gospels one with another, it is usual to suppose that the later writer had the earlier Gospel before him in the original Greek and copied from it. This seems to be the only hypothesis which will account for those places in which we find two or more Gospels running word for word and letter for letter parallel with one another. Some examples have been given in the first lecture. Others are: Matthew xi., 23a and Luke x., 15 (And thou Capernaum, etc.): Matthew xi., 10 and Luke vii., 27 (Behold I send my messenger, etc.). Mark i., 2 is different. Matthew xiv., 14a and Mark vi., 34a: Matthew xv., 32 and Mark viii., 2 (I am filled with compassion, etc.): Matthew xx., 28 and Mark x., 45

(The son of man came not, etc.): Matthew xvi., 28 and Luke ix., 27 and Mark ix., 1 (There be some standing here who shall not taste of death until they see—and then each narrator goes his own way).

It will be seen that there is hardly a single verse of *narrative* word for word the same in two gospels. When we consider the total absence of various readings from the text of the Hebrew Bible, and how, when a later author cites an earlier, he does so for the most part in the words of the former, as the Chronicler does the Books of Samuel and Kings, it is difficult to imagine a set of circumstances which would fit in with what meets us in the Gospels. The hypothesis of an original Greek source accounts for the coincidences of expression in them, but not for the discrepancies. These latter are the rift in the lute. Moreover, we have to bear in mind the not inconsiderable number of readings in the Gospels which are due to deliberate or unconscious attempts on the part of the copyists to bring them into agreement with one another. Thus the proverb, "Wisdom is justified by her works" in Matthew xi., 19 takes in certain MSS. the form which it has in Luke vii., 35. It is impossible to say how far this process was carried; but it is always open to account for a word for word and letter for letter agreement between two or more Gospels by it. On the other hand, that it was not carried out so as to leave

fewer discrepancies than it has done, is a good ground of confidence in the text as it stands.

The same remark may apply to the citations from the Old Testament which are found in the New. Where these agree, as they generally do, with the Greek rather than with the Hebrew Bible, this may quite well be due to the activity of copyists, whose own language was Greek. The commandments in Matthew xix., 18, 19 are identical in wording with the Greek version. But here again the points of agreement are of less weight than the points of difference, since the former do not prove that the *authors* of the Gospels used the Greek text; whereas the divergencies show that they were not using it. "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise," Matthew xxi., 16, does seem a clear quotation from the LXX., seeing that Psalm viii. 2 is the only place in which it renders the Hebrew word *'oz* (strength) by αἶνος. The Hebrew word has, in fact, both meanings, and the Seventy knew this, for they translate it by "honour" (τιμή), "glory" (δόξα), or some word of similar meaning, as well as by "strength" (δύναμις, ἰσχύς).

Moreover, it will be found on examination that those citations in which the Gospel text agrees most closely with the Greek of the Old Testament are precisely those in which that Greek agrees most closely with the Hebrew, that is to say, the first five books, which are the ones most carefully

rendered by the LXX., and the book of Psalms, in which the LXX. translation is slavishly literal. But in their citations from the prophets the evangelists cannot be said to be quoting the Greek rather than the Hebrew. As the Christian Church spread beyond the bounds of Palestine into the Greek-speaking countries, Hebrew would inevitably drop out, and all quotations be assimilated to the Greek Bible of the Jews of the Dispersion. But if we could get back to the gospel text of the first century, it would no doubt be much closer in its citations from the Old Testament to the Hebrew than to the Greek.

Perhaps the best parallel to the problem of the synoptic Gospels is to be found in the Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible. The oldest, the LXX., being much used by the Christians and therefore objected to by the Jews, a fresh, extremely literal, translation, that of Aquila, was made some time about 150 A.D. Towards the end of the century a third translation, that of Theodotion, was made, based upon the LXX. In the Greek Bible the book of Daniel appears in this last form instead of the LXX. Theodotion was quickly followed by Symmachus. If we could imagine the Hebrew Bible to be lost, then the problem which would present itself as to the origin of these four Greek versions would be very similar to that which meets us in the four Gospels. Perhaps the best preparation for the study of the

texts of the latter would be that of the Greek versions of Daniel. It is interesting also to note that the citations from the Old Testament in the book of Acts appear to keep much closer to the Greek than those of the third Gospel, although both are by the same author.

The following are some examples:—Matthew ii., 15, Out of Egypt have I called my son (Hosea xi., 1): iv., 15, 16, The Land of Zebulon (Isaiah ix., 1, 2): viii., 17, He took our weaknesses (Isaiah liii., 4): ix., 13, I will have mercy (Hosea vi., 6): xi., 10, I send my messenger (Malachi iii., 1): xii., 18, Behold my servant (Isaiah xlii., 1): xiii., 35, I will open my mouth (Psalms lxxviii. 2): xxii., 44 (Psalms cx., 1): xxiii., 35, Zecharias, son of Barachias (II. Chronicles xxiv., 20f.): xxvi., 31, I will smite the shepherd (Zechariah xiii., 7). Luke i., 17, Turn the hearts of the fathers (Malachi iv., 6): iv., 18, The spirit of the Lord is upon me (Isaiah lxi., 1). In none of these can the author of the Gospel be said to be quoting the LXX. Indeed, where the Gospel does quote the Greek text literally, it would often be difficult to think of any other words in which the Hebrew could be expressed: for example, Luke xxiii., 30, Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Cover us, etc. (Hosea x., 8): How else could it be said? Frequently the words of the Greek text are used, but in a different order, *e.g.*, Matthew

xv., 9 (Isaiah xxix., 13): xxi., 5 (Zechariah ix., 9): xxii., 37 (Deuteronomy vi., 5).

The purport of these lectures is to show that a certain number of the variants in the Gospel reports are most naturally explained as different renderings of a Gospel in another language than Greek—namely Hebrew, using that term in its New Testament sense as including Aramaic. On one or two grounds it may no doubt be maintained that the evidence is against such a supposition. It might be argued that there are grammatical constructions in our present Gospels which are not possible in Hebrew, and, on the other hand, many mannerisms of the Hebrew are wanting in the Greek text. A typical Hebrew idiom is that used to express a person's age by saying that he is a son of so many years. "Moses was a son of 120 years at his death." But this figure is never made use of in the Gospels, nor, for the matter of that, in the New Testament. To reckon this, however, an argument against the Gospels having been translated out of Hebrew would be fallacious, because very rarely does the Greek text of the Old Testament make use of this phrase, though it occurs scores of times in the Hebrew. A better argument would be found in the Hebrew way of expressing our "again" by the verb "to add." "He went again" is in Hebrew "he added to go" "he added and went." In the Greek Old Testament this Hebraism is generally retained (Genesis

xxv., 1, etc.), whereas the Gospels simply use the adverb "again" (πάλιν) regularly, as the LXX. does sometimes (Genesis viii., 10, etc). Still, there are at least a few places in the first three Gospels in which the Hebrew phrase is visible, shining through the Greek (Luke xix., 11: xx., 11, 12: and Mark 8, 25, "and he was restored and saw" should probably be simply "and he saw again"). The fact that this expression is found in the third Gospel and not in Acts is another evidence of a greater Hebrew influence upon the former.

On the other hand, we find expressions in the Greek New Testament which would be impossible in Hebrew. In the Semitic languages generally it is not allowable to express the agent of a passive verb. We cannot say "Abel was killed by Cain": we must say "Cain killed Abel." The former construction is, however, quite common in the Gospels (Matthew iii., 14, "to be baptized by thee": xx., 23: Luke iii., 19, xiii., 17, etc.). But then this construction is found also in the Greek of the Old Testament, though it is not found in the Hebrew (Daniel ii., 6, Greek, "you shall be glorified by me": Hebrew, "you shall receive glory from me").

A further objection to the Greek Gospels ever having been in any sense a translation from an original Hebrew Gospel might be urged on the score of vocabulary. Several specifically Greek words occur in the course of the narrative, and the

authors do not think of explaining their meaning, whereas when Hebrew or Aramaic words are used they are regularly interpreted in Greek. It is natural to assume that these interpretations would not be in the Hebrew original, if such there were. But this does not follow. The Jewish mediæval commentator, Rashi, though he wrote in Hebrew, frequently explains Hebrew by means of Old French words. There are Greek words in the book of Daniel, and there would be more in a Hebrew Gospel, just as there are Latin words in the Greek Gospels, and Greek words in the Mishnah. Some of these Greek words would come into the popular Aramaic by way of the LXX., such as Hades for Sheol (Matthew xi., 23: Luke x., 15). The names of the coins would naturally be Latin or Greek (Matthew xvii., 27: Mark xii., 15, etc.), as in Syria they were lately Turkish, and the Serai would be called the Prætorium. Military terms such as "legion" (Matthew xxvi., 53) and "custodia" (xxvii., 65) would naturally not be turned into Hebrew. Even terms proper to the Jewish religion, such as synagogue (Luke iv., 16), Sanhedrin (Matthew xxvi., 59), phylacteries (Matthew xxiii., 5), were Greek. All such Greek and Latin words would have become naturalized in Aramaic before they passed into the text of the Greek Gospels. Some of those terms also which may be regarded as specifically Christian would appear to have been Greek from the beginning.

There is no hint that the Twelve were ever called by any other than the Greek name of Apostles. It is worth noting, however, that it is in St. Luke's Gospel that we are told that they were so named (vi., 13); and his is the most thoroughly Greek of the three.

One good argument against our Gospels being derived from a Hebrew or Aramaic original arises out of their relation to the Old Testament Apocrypha. There is good ground for believing that many of these books were originally composed in Hebrew, and that this original has been lost and the Greek translation alone has survived. But there is no reason to suppose that the second book of Maccabees was written in any other language than Greek; and this is the one book to which the Gospels are more closely related than to any other. It is taken up with the persecutions of the Jewish people under their Greek masters, and it naturally made a strong appeal to the infant Christian Church in its sufferings at the hand of both Jew and Gentile. A number of words used in the Gospels are found in the LXX. only in II. Maccabees. The phrase translated in the Authorized Version "journeying," literally, making a journey (Luke xiii., 22), occurs only II. Mac. (iii., 8: xii., 10), also Xenophon, *Anabasis,* V., vi., 11, and elsewhere outside the LXX.: so "an austere man" (Luke xix., 21) and "austerity" and "austere," II. Mac., xiv., 30: "unawares"

(Luke xxi., 34) and the adjective and adverb, II. Mac. v., 5: xiv., 17, 22: "was at the point of death" (Luke vii., 2) only in II. Mac. (vi., 30: vii., 18, nearly): Luke xxii., 6, "in the absence of the multitude" or "without a tumult," the preposition ἄτερ only in II. Mac. xii., 15, "without battering rams": "the (scarlet) robe," Matthew xxvii., 28 and II. Mac. xii., 35 only: the word "mourning" in Matthew ii., 18 taken from Jeremiah xxxi., 15, elsewhere only II. Mac. xi., 6. There are also many phrases common to the Gospels and II. Maccabees, but found in other places also. "Traitor," "they begin to sink," "under authority," "moved with compassion" (Mark i., 41), Luke's use of the word "set" (vii., 8), and "easier" (Matthew ix., 5), are some of the links between them out of very many. But even this argument would not prove that one or more of our Gospels was not in whole or in part translated out of Hebrew, but only that the translators served themselves heirs to the treasury of words found in II. Maccabees.

We turn now to the positive evidence in favour of the Gospel having been composed, and probably written down, first in Hebrew, and first the external evidence.

The statements of the Christian fathers to the effect that there was an original Hebrew Gospel are reported by Eusebius in the *Ecclesiastical History*. In the account of Origen found there, the

following from his commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel is given: "The first Gospel to be written was that of Matthew, once a publican, but afterwards the apostle of Jesus Christ, who issued it composed in Hebrew for the use of the believers from Judaism."

Origen was the first real scholar of the New Testament. He died in the year 253 or 254 at the age of about 68. He is far and away the greatest of the fathers of the Greek Church, and the only one whom the Catholic Church has refused to canonize. He goes on: "The second (Gospel) is that according to Mark, made under the guidance of Peter, who also acknowledges him as his son in his catholic epistle" (I. v., 13). He continues: "And the third, that according to Luke, the Gospel praised by Paul, which was written for the faithful from the Gentiles; and last of all, that according to John" (vi., 35).

But the *locus classicus* on this point occurs in book III., chapter 39, in the account of Papias, who is reported as saying: "And [John] the presbyter said this: 'Mark, the interpreter of Peter, wrote accurately whatever he remembered, not, however, in order, the things spoken or done by our Lord; for he neither heard our Lord nor followed him; but later, as I have said, Peter, who made his instructions fit his needs, but not as making an orderly report of our Lord's sayings; so that Mark erred in nothing, in thus writing some

things as he remembered them, for one thing he made his chief care, not to pass over anything which he had heard, nor to lie in them.' " Papias continues: " Matthew drew up the sayings in the Hebrew dialect, and each one interpreted them as he was able."

The importance of Papias lies in the fact that he was bishop of Hierapolis when Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna, and Polycarp had known St. John the evangelist; but Eusebius rather discounts the value of his witness when he declares that Papias was " very small of wit." His reason for saying so was that Papias believed that the Apostles had taught that there would be a physical millenium after the resurrection upon this earth.

Long after Hebrew had ceased to be the medium of commerce and of everyday life among the Jews, it lingered on as the language of learning and religion. It was spoken of as the " holy tongue," and would naturally be used by men of the patriotic party. It was the language and also the script used on the coins struck during the last revolt of the Jews in the year 135 A.D., and there was a considerable literature written in it in the first Christian centuries. Of the books originally composed in Hebrew, of which the originals have perished, the most familiar example is the book of Ecclesiasticus, composed in Hebrew and translated into Greek in Egypt by the grandson of the author about the year 130 B.C.

Fortunately, in this case parts of the original Hebrew have been recovered and published. Jerome, also, in his preface to the book of Kings —the famous "*prologus galeatus*"—states that the first book of Maccabees was originally composed in Hebrew, and that this is borne out by the internal evidence of the book itself. Jerome indeed states that he had himself seen the MS. It is generally supposed to be lost, but Kennicott in the *Dissertatio Generalis* mentions two MSS. of it, No. 474 in Rome and No. 613 in Hamburg. Eusebius also (*Ecclesiastical History*, VI., 25) gives a list of Hebrew books quoted from Origen, ending with Maccabees, of which he gives the Hebrew title as SARBETHSARBANAIEL, which Dalman has interpreted "prince of the house of the Hasmonæans." There was also a parchment roll containing a short fictitious history of Antiochus in Archbishop Marsh's Library, Dublin (*cf*. Bartoloccius, *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, I., 383).[1] Eusebius also (*Ecclesiastical History*, VI., 14) cites Clement of Alexandria as asserting that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul in Hebrew and translated into Greek by St. Luke for the Greeks, or, according to III., 38, by Clement of Rome. As the only New Testament books which were composed in Palestine were the Gospel of Matthew and the Epistle of James, it

[1] It is not mentioned in Scott & White's *Catalogue*, published in 1913, being now in the Bodleian.

is not likely that any other of the books were written in any other language than that in which we possess them. Josephus' *Wars of the Jews* was also, as stated in the preface, first written in Hebrew.

Besides what has been mentioned above, there is good evidence, some external and some internal, that the greater part of the Old Testament Apocrypha also was originally composed in Hebrew or Aramaic. Jerome states in his preface to the book of Tobit that he had used a Chaldee, that is, Aramaic, copy for his Latin translation. Dr. Neubauer believed that this was a longer form of the Bodleian MS. which he edited (Oxford, 1878). There are two Hebrew versions given in Walton (*cf.* also Origen, Epistle to Africanus, par. 13). It is also now generally agreed that the book of Judith is a translation from a Hebrew or Aramaic original (otherwise Origen, *loc. cit.*). The Epistle of Jeremy, the additions to Daniel, and the first three chapters of Baruch all show signs of having been translated from Hebrew. The book of Wisdom, on the other hand, was probably originally composed in Greek. The rest are doubtful.

What is true of the Old Testament Apocrypha is no less true of the Pseudepigrapha. There is good reason for holding that the book of Jubilees, the books of Adam and Eve, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption of Moses,

II. Baruch, IV. Ezra, and the Psalms of Solomon were all originally written in Hebrew, although in every case the Hebrew original has been lost. Of the Book of Enoch, chapters I.-V. and XXXVII.-CIV. are believed to have been written in Hebrew, and the intervening chapters in Aramaic.[2] What appears to be the Aramaic original of the story of Ahikar has been recovered among the Papyri found at Elephantine in Egypt (Sachau, "Aramaeische Papyrus und Ostraka aus Elephantine," p. 147ff.). Democritus the philosopher is said by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata,* II., 15: Dindorff, p. 56) to have learned the story of Ahikar from a Babylonian stele. The Papyri may date about 400 B.C.

All this witness to the fact of "Hebrew" having still been both the literary and the colloquial language of Palestine in the first Christian century makes it difficult to believe that the earliest Christian records were drawn up in any other language than "Hebrew." Until the Christian faith passed beyond the bounds of Palestine, there was no motive for writing in any other language. This early Gospel may have been oral, and learned by heart by the disciples, as is the way in the East, but it was probably in writing, and there may well have been more than one book written. It may have been one of our three Gospels, or it may have

[2] Charles: *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.*

perished, and survive only in a form like that of the early document which is usually coupled along with St. Mark's Gospel as forming our earliest sources, as an element incorporated in the present text. But that St. Matthew's Gospel was, as stated by Papias, first composed in Hebrew, and that our present Gospel is merely a translation, is put beyond a doubt by a single verse, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins" (i., 21: *cf.* Luke i., 31). This verse has no meaning in English or Greek, nor in any other than a Semitic language, in which the name "Jesus" means "save." If it be replied that this would only prove that the first chapter was a translation from the Hebrew, the answer is that it does not stand alone. The same thing is true of the sentence: "When you come to a house, salute it; and if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it; but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you again" (x., 12, 13). The whole point of these verses lies in the fact that in the original language "salute" would be "pray for its peace"; but this is as completely lost in the Greek as it is in the English.[3]

On the other hand, John xx., 22, "He breathed on them and said, Receive the holy *breath*" might be taken as proving that that Gospel was written originally in Greek, but the Greek words for

[3] Mrs. Lewis: *A Translation of the Four Gospels from the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest*, p. xvi.

" breathe " and " breath " are quite different, and the reference no doubt is to Gensis ii., 7, where the Hebrew words are different also.

The " Hebrew " language is referred to several times in the New Testament. Thus, in John v., 2, " a pool, which in the Hebrew tongue is called Bethesda " (?); xix., 13, " a place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha "; xix., 17, "a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew, Golgotha." All these names, however, Bethesda, Gabbatha, Golgotha, are not Hebrew but Aramaic, and in other passages also by " Hebrew " we are to understand, not the language of the Old Testament, but the Aramaic, which was spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ. In Acts, Aramaic is " their [proper] tongue " (i., 19). The voice which St. Paul heard on the way to Damascus spoke " in the Hebrew tongue " (Acts xxvi., 14), and he himself, when he addressed the mob in Jerusalem, used the language in which he knew he would most easily obtain a hearing (xxi., 40: xxii., 2), no doubt Aramaic. The inscription on the Cross, on the other hand, may have been in the more official Hebrew; and in the book of Revelation the names Abaddon (ix., 11) and Armageddon (xvi., 16) are really Hebrew. The Church Fathers, when they speak of " Hebrew," mean Aramaic.

The difference between Hebrew and Aramaic is very little greater than the difference between

the Arabic spoken to-day in Syria and Egypt and that spoken in Algeria and Morocco. They are very much closer to one another than Latin and Greek. It does not, therefore, make very much difference whether we speak of Hebrew or of Aramaic in the majority of places. Where a divergence in the Greek of the New Testament can be explained by the Hebrew, it can often equally well be explained by the Aramaic. In what follows, the name "Hebrew" will be used to include Aramaic in many places, unless formally contrasted with it.

If it be granted that the earliest Gospel was composed in the language which Jesus and His disciples certainly spoke among themselves, namely, "Hebrew" commonly so-called, the next point is, In what particular form of Hebrew was it written?

There are three dialects which come into view. That which we most naturally think of in regard to Jesus and His disciples is the dialect of Galilee. This differed from that of Judea, so that anyone who came from there was soon recognized (Matthew xxvi., 73: Luke xxii., 59: Mark xiv., 70). The Talmud states that the Galilæan dialect was marked by the omission of the gutturals. There are one or two places in the Gospels where it is just possible that a variation in the wording may be due to the omission of a guttural, as Mark iii., 16, which has "made twelve" for "having

chosen twelve" of Luke vi., 13. Again Matthew xxi., 23 and Luke xx., 1 state that it was when Jesus was *teaching* in the temple that He was asked for His authority, but Mark xi., 27 says when He was *walking* in the temple. Also Matthew xxiv., 6 and Mark xiii., 7 have "wars and rumours of wars," for which "wars and catastrophes" occurs in Luke xxi., 9. All these differ in the insertion or omission of a guttural letter. The Talmud (Erubhin 53b) states that the students in Judea attended one Rabbi, memorized his words, and taught others. Hence their language was correct and accurate; whilst the students of Galilee attended many Rabbis, and so did not remember their words nor teach them to others. The references in the Talmud to the Galilæan dialect require to be considerably discounted for two reasons: (1) They mostly refer to times long subsequent to those of the New Testament, and (2) they are evidently intended to cast ridicule upon those who spoke it. Thus there is one story of a Galilæan asking, Who has a sheep ('mr)? The others asked, Is it an ass (hmr) to ride, or wine (khmr) to drink, or wool ('mr) to wear, or a sheep ('mr) to eat? The absurdity of this story lies in the fact that it has no sense except in *writing*. In *sound* the words supposed to be so easily confused are really quite different, *immar* (sheep), *hamr* (ass), *khamar* (wine), and *'amar* (wool).

The second of the three dialects in which a

primitive Gospel might have been written is the late Hebrew which was used by the Rabbis of the first and second Christian centuries. Their discussions are contained for the most part in those portions of the Talmud which are called the Mishnah, which was finished about the year 200 A.D. It is the tradition spoken of in the Gospels. In substance it is an amplification of the Mosaic laws. The language of the Mishnah is a form of Hebrew simpler than that of the Old Testament, and having a certain admixture of Aramaic. It is true that the well-known Aramaic scholar Dalman says that it is Aramaic with an admixture of Hebrew, but this is merely, *more germanico,* for the sake of contradicting his predecessors. It is natural to suppose that Jesus, who was perhaps the first to bear the title Rabbi, would employ the same language as the other Rabbis did, but, on the other hand, as His aim was not to establish a school, but to win the hearts of the common people, He may not have done so. The Rabbis, however, did not limit themselves to Hebrew. In the tractate usually called "The Sayings of the Fathers," the second saying of Hillel, an older contemporary of Jesus, is in pure Aramaic, whilst the first is in almost as pure Hebrew. Hillel, however, came from Mesopotamia, and so was not an out and out Palestinian. Sometimes the same saying will be found in one place in Hebrew and in another place in the

sister language. Hillel's grandson, Gamaliel, the teacher of St. Paul, and the first to bear the title of Rabban, has his saying in the same tractate reported in Hebrew. One other saying is ascribed to him in the Abhoth (Fathers) of Rabbi Nathan, section XL. (in Schechter's edition, p. 127). On the other hand, three letters of his, addressed to the Jews of Galilee, Judea, and of the Dispersion, are in Aramaic. The descendants of Hillel held the presidency of the Sanhedrin for many a generation, and this may have led to the freer use of Aramaic. In any case, Rabbi Jehudah the Holy, who lived somewhere about the year 200 A.D., and to whom the editing of the Mishnah is ascribed, expressly condemned the use of Aramaic by the Jews of Palestine, and offered them the choice between Hebrew and Greek. Thus in the time of Jesus, Aramaic would be the language of the people, Hebrew the language of the schools. Jesus would naturally use the one in addressing the multitude, and the other in His discussions with the Rabbis.

The Mishnah has a good many points of contact with the wording of the Gospels. The following are examples: the rhetorical question introducing a simile, with its answer. To what is so and so like? It is like, etc. (Matthew xi., 16: ch. xiii.: vii., 24, 26: Mark iv., 30: Luke xiii., 18f.): "in this world and that which is to come" (Matthew xii., 32): "loosing and binding" (Matthew xvi., 19:

xviii., 18): the discussion with the Sadducees (Matthew xxii., 23ff.). In "his brother shall *marry*" (v. 24), the first Gospel uses the word employed by the LXX. to translate the Hebrew technical term: Mark xii., 19 and Luke xx., 28 have the colourless word "take": the use of the word "heaven" instead of "God," as in the phrase Kingdom of Heaven: God as "Father"; and many more. The titles Rab and Rabbi and Rabban were just coming "into vogue" in the time of Jesus, and this may have accentuated His dislike to them. It is indeed often declared that there is little in the teaching of Jesus which cannot be paralleled in the Talmud, but those who make these statements are not always careful to add that the passages in the Talmud are always later than those in the Gospels, and not improbably derived from them. The only important exception to this is the use of the periphrasis "word" instead of "God."

The third of the possible dialects in which a primitive Gospel would naturally have been composed, is that which was spoken by the native population of Palestine at the time of Christ, the Aramaic. This held the place which has been occupied for many centuries now by Arabic, and which may in the future be taken once more after the passing of two thousand years by Hebrew. The evidence in favour of Aramaic in the Gospels is very strong. There are: (1) the proper names,

and the use of *bar* instead of *ben*: Bartholemew, Barjonas, Barabbas, Barachias (?), Bartimæus, Beelzebul, Bethesda. (2) The Semitic words ending in *a* are Aramaic: raka, matmona, pascha, golgotha, abba, gabbatha, and others outside the Gospels also. (3) All the words of Jesus which are not in Greek are in Aramaic, not Hebrew: talitha cumi (or cum), ephphatha, Elohi Elohi lema shebhaktani. So St. Paul's maranatha. (4) Semitic words with Greek endings are probably Aramaic, Pharisaios, Satanas, Messaias. (5) The word translated "to use vain repetitions" (βαττολογεῖν) is probably the Aramaic *btel.*

Certain forms, on the other hand, might be either Aramaic or Hebrew, as Gehenna, Boanerges, Rabbon or Rabboni. The Hebrew words met with are the following: hosanna, Rabbi, Eli, corban, and Abbadon and Armageddon in the Apocalypse.

The evidence, it will be seen, is clearly in favour of the archetype of the Gospels having been written in Aramaic rather than in Hebrew. But, truth to tell, as has been said above, it makes very little difference which it was. Late Hebrew has many common terms with Aramaic, such as the frequent use of the participle for the finite verb; and the vocabulary is practically the same for both. One of the main differences is that the Aramaic uses the participle *de* for "of," which the Hebrew omits. In what follows, the distinction between

the two is not pressed, and the name Hebrew will generally be used to include both dialects.

In the last two lectures an attempt is made to account for a certain number of variations between the different Gospels or between different MSS. of the same Gospel on the ground that they are varying translations of an original Hebrew or Aramaic Gospel.

NOTE ON LXX. AND THEODOTION TO DANIEL

Perhaps the best preparation which any one could make who would attempt the solution of the hitherto insoluble Synoptic problem would be a careful study of the Greek versions of the Old Testament. A comparison, for example, of the LXX. version of the book of Daniel with the revision of Theodotion shows that the resemblances and divergences of these two are very similar to the resemblances and divergencies to be met with in the first three Gospels. In those portions of Daniel which are written in Hebrew, the two Greek versions agree as closely as our Gospels ever do for any length at a time, though the resemblance is never so great as would be found in the case of two MSS. of the same original work. They are, at their very closest, evidently versions or translations from another tongue. In the Aramaic portions of Daniel, on the other hand, the

divergence is very much wider, and resembles what we meet with in the first three Gospels in those places where they do not run quite parallel. The LXX. rendering has many repetitions and omissions: it leaves out chap. iv., verses 3-6, and chap. v., verses 14, 15 and 18-22; and it is often so free that it becomes rather a paraphrase than a translation. It would be fairly easy to retranslate the former portions of the book back from the Greek into the original Hebrew with tolerable accuracy; but, in the case of the latter portions, the only feasible plan would be to ignore the LXX. version and follow Theodotion alone. When we turn, on the other hand, to some portions of the book of Daniel which do not exist, and never existed, either in Hebrew or in Aramaic, we find the two Greek texts agreeing almost *verbatim*, verse after verse, as for example in the Prayer of Azariah and the "Song of the Three Children," inserted before chap. iii., verse 24. They now no longer have the appearance of versions, but rather of two MSS. of the same original work.

The case of the Gospels exhibits the same phenomena. There are places where they agree as closely as do two MSS. of the same book, and in that respect they do not show any traces of being translations at all. In most passages, however, they present the appearance of being independent versions from another language, and, if Mark's is the earliest of the three Gospels, then Matthew

would have the appearance of being in many places a revision of Mark, made with a view of bringing him nearer to the original Hebrew or Aramaic text, just as the version of Theodotion of the book of Daniel is a revision of the LXX. version, made with the view of bringing it into closer resemblance to the Hebrew and Aramaic texts. And there is still a third class of passages in which the three Gospels scarcely seem to have had a common written source at all. In the story of the cure of Peter's wife's mother, for instance, each narrator seems to tell the tale in his own way, as best he remembered it (Matthew viii., 14f.: Mark i., 29ff.: Luke iv., 38f.).

At the same time, the parallel case of the Greek versions of the Old Testament would assist us only in regard to the verbal differences which are to be found in the Gospels. It would render no aid in regard to the great and important divergence which exists in the arrangement and order of the sections and the sequence of the chronology.

LECTURE IV

Hebraisms giving rise to variants—poverty of Hebrew and wealth of Greek grammar and vocabulary—variants due to this—some Hebrew words frequently confused in the Old Testament and New Testament—strange renderings of the Greek Old Testament—classes of Gospel variants explicable through Hebrew—scribal errors—errors of numbers—mistranslations.

MANY of the variants met with in the Gospels are without controversy best accounted for as being alternative renderings from some other language. If the Gospel story was first written down in Hebrew, it would not be long before it was turned into Greek, or even, it may be, Latin. And it would be translated, as Papias says, by more than one hand. These different translations, of which the first Gospel may have been one, would have been used by the authors of our present texts, and the present and following lecture will be devoted to trying to show how many of the variations of the Greek texts disappear when turned back into the original Hebrew or Aramaic out of which they sprang. Before taking up isolated passages, it will be well to deal with some groups of passages, in each of which the variants are due to the same cause.

It was formerly supposed that every expression in New Testament Greek which resembled Hebrew

was a Hebraism. Such were Mark viii., 15, Beware of (*lit.* look from) the leaven of the Pharisees: so xii., 38: i., 15, The time *is fulfilled*: Matthew v., 22, in danger of (ἔνοχος) the judgment: Mark vi., 7, two and two (*lit.* two, two): the use of the participle before the finite verb, which looks like the Hebrew infinitive absolute. Many of these supposed Hebraisms have, however, been found in the Egyptian papyri, and so are shown to be parts of the current Greek of the time and place.[1] If we consider, however, the very large rôle played by the Jews in Egypt, both in commercial and literary circles, it is quite possible that the Greek not only of Egypt but of countries outside as well became tinged with Hebrew phrases. But even after deducting what the papyri show to have been assimilated into the Greek popular language of the centuries between Alexander the Great and the Christian Era, the language of the New Testament, and especially of the Gospels, teems with words and phrases and constructions which can hardly be anything else than Hebrew or Aramaic.

Perhaps the most striking example of all is a mode of expression which occurs on nearly every page of the historical books of the Old Testament, and is very frequently employed in the Gospels. Classical Hebrew introduces a temporal clause

[1] *Cf.* Moulton & Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament.*

with the phrase "and it came to pass." Then comes the temporal clause, and the main clause is introduced by "and" instead of "that" or "then." Thus, II. Samuel viii., 1, And it came to pass after these things that (*lit.* and) David smote the Philistines. So Luke ix., 28, And it came to pass after these words . . . that (*lit.* and) . . . he went up into a mountain: xix., 15, And it came to pass on his return . . . that (*lit.* and) he commanded . . . . ; and so frequently. Occasionally, both in the Old Testament and the New Testament, the "and it came to pass" is left out: Luke ii., 21, And when eight days were fulfilled then (*lit.* and) His name was called Jesus: Matthew vii., 14, Because strait is the gate . . . then (*lit.* and) few there be that find it. Sometimes the "and" = "then" is omitted. Matthew, xiii., 53, And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these parables, He removed thence; and so often. It is to be observed that this Hebraism is not found in the fourth Gospel, but often in the Acts. The fact that it occurs oftener in Luke and even in Acts than in Matthew and Mark together is good evidence for a Hebrew source both at the back of the Gospel and, though not to anything like the same extent, at the back of Acts. Since Dalman (quoted by Menzies) states that this construction is not Aramaic, one might conclude that the source for the Gospels and for Acts was Hebrew rather than Aramaic.

It occurs, however, in the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine (Sachau, No. 1, l. 9), "Also it happened that they destroyed the doors," or something very like it; and it is used in Daniel iii., 7, according to the translation of Theodotion. It is very probable that the complete phrase was found in many more places in the Gospels than the present text shows. As it is, the second "and" = "then" is in many instances omitted in some MSS. whilst it is retained in others.[2]

Aramaic and, still more, Hebrew are very poor in adjectives. This lack is partly made up for by a half poetical use of the abstract noun in place of the adjective. A deceitful man is "a man of deceit" (Psalm lv., 23, etc.), a trustworthy man "a man of trust" (Nehemiah vii., 2), and in Luke xvi., 8, the unjust steward is literally "the steward of dishonesty": the ordinary non-Biblical English of "the throne of his glory" (Matthew xix., 28) would be "his glorious throne," and the present-day English for "kingdom of heaven" would be "ideal republic" or some such term. It was always open to the Greek translator to render the Hebrew phrase literally or to turn it into the Western idiom. Hence we find in Matthew iii., 16, "spirit of God," but in the parallel, Luke iii., 22, "holy spirit." So in Ecclus. xlv., 2, "glory

[2] I am indebted for this point to a former student and friend, the late Lieutenant Robert Stevenson, M.A.

of the holy ones" is in the Hebrew "glory of God."

A special case of this usage is that in which the word "God" or "Lord" is added to a noun to denote a high degree of excellence. In the Authorized Version "the great mountains" (Psalm xxxvi., 6) is in Hebrew "mountains of God": "the goodly cedars," "cedars of God" (Psalm lxxx., 10): "an exceeding great city," "a great city of God" (Jonah iii., 3). In other cases the Authorized Version renders the Hebrew idiom. In Psalm lxviii., 15, "the hill of God" means simply a very great hill: in Genesis i., 2, "the spirit of God," and in Isaiah xl., 7, "the spirit of the Lord" are a mighty wind; and so "the blast of God" in Job iv., 9. The "ark of God" means simply the sacred chest, and the "sons of God" good people. Perhaps the most striking instance of this difference of idiom in the New Testament is the saying of the centurion at the Cross. In the third Gospel the words are "Certainly this was a righteous man," or "this man was righteous" (xxiii., 47), whereas in the first and second Gospels the words are, "Truly this was a (*or* the) son of God" (Matthew xxvii., 54): similarly Mark xv., 39). It seems quite clear that "righteous man" and "son of God *or* of a god" are only alternative renderings of the Hebrew or Aramaic "son of God," the first Gospel translating literally, the third giving the natural Greek

equivalent. In other words, Matthew is thinking in Hebrew, whilst Luke is thinking in Greek. The natural Greek rendering of the Semitic "son of God" would be "divine man," but to speak of a divine man, as Plato for instance does of Socrates, would be to a Hebrew meaningless, seeing that none can be divine but God. Any other usage would be poetical, as the fourth book of the Maccabees speaks of divine philosophy (vii., 10), or Ecclus. vi., 35, of a "godly discourse."

It is well known that there are strictly speaking in Hebrew and Aramaic no tenses, and only two forms of the verb which have to do duty for the many tenses of Greek or Latin. Hence we are not surprised to find that the different Gospels constantly use different tenses in the parallel passages of the Greek text. Instances are: "Thy daughter is dead," Mark v., 35, aorist, Luke viii., 49, perfect: "believe" in next verse, Mark present, Luke aorist: "What went ye out for to see?" Matthew xi., 7, aorist, Luke vii., 24, perfect; so also in "The son of man came," Matthew xi., 19, Luke vii., 34; and so in the phrases, "He is risen from the dead," "Elias will come and restore all," "Elias is come already," and frequently. Often in the LXX. the Hebrew imperfect is paraphrased by the Greek verb μέλλειν "to be about to," and the same thing occurs frequently in the Gospels, for instance, Matthew xvii., 22 and Luke ix., 44, "The son of man is about to be betrayed,"

but not in Mark ix., 31 ("is being betrayed"): Matthew xvi., 27, "about to come in glory," but otherwise in Mark viii., 38 and Luke ix., 26. The LXX. does not use θέλειν "to will" to express the simple future of the Hebrew, as *volo* is used in late Latin, but perhaps an example of this is Luke xiii., 31, "Herod will (*lit.* wishes to) kill thee." In classical Hebrew the Latin pluperfect is expressed in no other way than by merely putting the subject at the beginning of the sentence instead of the verb, which usually begins the sentence. An example of this construction is II. Samuel xviii., 18, and so often. In post-classical Hebrew even this disappears (Ezra vi., 20), as also in Aramaic (Ezra v., 12). This may account for three of the most serious discrepancies which are to be found in the Gospels. The cleansing of the Temple is placed in the first three Gospels at the very end of the ministry of Jesus, but in the fourth Gospel at the beginning. If the author of an account of this incident, writing in good Hebrew, had begun by saying, "Now Jesus on a previous occasion had gone into the Temple," he would merely have said "Then Jesus went" instead of the usual "Then went Jesus." A translator accustomed to the Hebrew of the first century would not notice the difference, and would naturally think the author was continuing the preceding narrative, instead of going back to an incident before that just mentioned.

A second narrative which may have met with the same fate is that of the woman with the alabaster box, which occurs early in the third Gospel (vii., 37), late in the others (xxvi., 6: xiv., 3: xii., 3). The Authorized English Version makes use of this fact to get over a third difficulty of the same kind in the eighteenth chapter of the fourth Gospel. In the first Gospel Jesus is taken before Caiaphas (xxvi., 57), but in the fourth before Annas (xviii., 13); but, by translating v. 24, "Now Annas *had* sent him bound unto Caiaphas," the English Version makes the examination take place before the latter. This is not impossible. The Sinai Palimpsest overcomes the difficulty by placing v. 24 after v. 13.

The Hebrew imperfect frequently includes the idea of beginning, and this may explain such variants as Matthew xx., 24, "the ten were incensed" and Mark x., 41, "began to be incensed": Luke viii., 37, "they asked him" and Mark v., 17, "they began to beseech him." There is no example of this, however, in the LXX.

Collective nouns are in Hebrew construed either as singulars or as plurals. This would account for many cases of differences of number as between the Gospels. Thus in Matthew xiii., 11 and Luke viii., 10 we have "mysteries," but in Mark iv., 11 "mystery." In the book of Daniel the translations of the LXX. and Theodotion have "mysteries" for "mystery" of the Aramaic only

at ii., 18. Elsewhere they all agree exactly. The LXX. renders the Hebrew word for "fruit" now as a singular, now as a plural. The same liberty is used in the Gospels, Matthew iii., 8, "fruit," Luke iii., 8, "fruits," and so on. A number of words in Hebrew have a plural form but a singular meaning, such as "face," "water," "heaven." In Syriac, "heaven" is either masculine or feminine, singular or plural. Hence Matthew iii., 16 and Mark i., 10 speak of the heavens being opened, Luke iii., 21, of heaven. And similarly we have in Luke vi., 9, "sabbath day," but in the parallel, Matthew xii., 12 and Mark iii., 4, "sabbath days": so Matthew xxiv., 30 and Mark xiii., 26 "clouds," but Luke xxi., 27 "cloud." Such minute variants are of no account.

If the first Gospel was written in Hebrew and translated, as Papias says, by different hands into Greek, a most fruitful source of variation would be the use of synonymous words, especially as Greek is a very much richer language than Hebrew. The latter has, for one thing, no compound words, so that the number of possible Greek equivalents for each Hebrew word is almost indefinite. It is a rare thing to find synonyms in a Semitic language for a Greek word. Some examples of Hebrew words which are constantly rendered by alternative words in Greek are the following. The Hebrew for—

"to say" = λέγειν and εἰπεῖν. It is curious how closely the first three Gospels agree in their use of these two (Matthew viii., 2: Mark i., 40: Luke v., 12: also Matthew ix., 5: Mark ii., 9: Luke v., 23), but the reverse is also common (Matthew ix., 2: Mark ii., 5, etc.). So the LXX. and Theodotion in Daniel ii., 27.

"to arise" = ἀνιστάναι and ἐγείρειν: Matthew ix., 25: Mark v., 42: Luke viii., 55: also Matthew xvii., 9: Mark ix., 9; and so on.

"to go away" = ἀπέρχεσθαι and πορεύεσθαι: This variation is very common in the LXX. as between Codex A and Codex B: Exodus v., 18: Judges i., 26: vi., 21: ix., 55, and often, in rendering the Hebrew *halakh*. Similar variations in the Gospels are: Mark i., 35: Luke iv., 42: Matthew xv., 21: Mark vii., 24; and frequently.

"man" = ἀνήρ and ἄνθρωπος: So Mark v., 2: Luke vii., 27: so also Daniel x., 19 as between LXX and Theodotion.

"word" = λόγος and ῥῆμα: Matthew vii., 28 and Luke vii., 1: so Daniel i., 20, and often.

"other" = ἕτερος and ἄλλος: Matthew xi., 3: Luke vii., 19: "Look we for another?" So in LXX and Theodotion of Daniel vii., 8, and elsewhere.

It is needless to multiply examples further. We have seen that the use of synonymous terms

instead of those in the ordinary texts is a characteristic of the Codex Bezae. There is no apparent motive for this procedure on the part of the author or copyist of this codex, and the most natural explanation seems to be that it is partly due to the original Greek texts having been more or less independent translations out of another language.

It is not, however, always the Greek which has the advantage of richness of vocabulary. Syriac has two or three words for "resurrection" for one in Greek. In one of the parables the kingdom of heaven is compared to "treasure hid in a field which a man, having found, hid." We would expect a different word for the second hiding, or at least "hid again." The Hebrew for the first "hid" would no doubt be some derivative of *taman,* to hide (*cf.* Jeremiah xli., 8). For the second, however, it was probably another word, namely *kachadh.* The latter word means "to say nothing about a thing." So Joshua vii., 19, "Tell me what you have done, do not *keep back* anything" (of hid treasure): I. Samuel iii., 17, 18: Job xx., 12. It is thus the opposite of "to publish" in Jeremiah l. (xxvii.), 2: "publish, do not *keep back.*" Hence the words in the parable should run: "treasure hid in a field, which a man having found *said nothing about,* and went and bought that field."

One of the features which distinguish Aramaic

and late Hebrew from classical Hebrew is the large use which is made of the participle in place of the finite verb. This is common in the Mishnah, and still more so perhaps in the Aramaic portions of Ezra and Daniel. Examples are Ezra iv., 17, "that dwell in Samaria," literally, "that dwelling in Samaria": vii., 24, "also we certify you" literally, "also to you certifying": Daniel iii., 3, "gathered" and "stood," literally, "gathering" and "standing": ii., 7, "they answered and said," literally, "they answered and saying"; and so on. A good example of a variation, due to this construction, resulting in the Greek of the Gospels, is to be found in Matthew xi., 18, as compared with Luke vii., 33. The text of the former runs: "for John came neither eating nor drinking, and *they* say, He hath a demon," but the latter, "for John the baptist has come neither eating bread nor drinking wine, and *you* say, he hath a demon." Both readings, "they say" and "you say" are equally legitimate renderings of the underlying Hebrew or Aramaic, which would be the one word "saying." Another instance of the same thing is found in Matthew xxi., 26, "we fear the people," as compared with Mark xi., 32, "they feared the people." The Hebrew or Aramaic would be simply, "fearing the people." A literal translation of this idiom appears to occur in Matthew xvii., 26, where the Authorized Version has "Peter saith unto him," but the Greek merely εἰπόντος δέ.

Probably the same thing was the original cause of the variant in Ezra v., 4, where for the (wrong) Hebrew "we said" the LXX has (rightly) "they said."

In the Semitic languages one word (in Hebrew *nefesh*) is used for the English words "life" and "soul" and "self." This is no doubt the reason why the phrase "to lose or forfeit his life or soul (τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ)," in Matthew xvi., 26 and Mark viii., 36, is in Luke ix., 25 "to lose or forfeit himself (ἑαυτόν)." There are several places in the Gospels where the Greek word ψυχή should be translated by "self" rather than "life," for example, Matthew xx., 28 and Mark x., 45, "to give *himself* a ransom for many": "If any man . . . . hate not his father and his mother . . . . and *himself*" (Luke xiv., 26). Here τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν is really a double translation of the Hebrew *nafshō*. As in the first example, Luke generally has the better Greek and Matthew the better Hebrew.

In the parable of the Pounds (Luke xix., 11ff.) it seems a great leap from the charge of ten pounds to the charge of ten cities (v. 17), and it has been suggested that for "cities" we should read "talents," the error arising out of a misreading of the original *kikkar* as *kerak,* a word familiar as the name of the famous fortress of the Crusaders at the southern end of the Dead Sea. This word *kerak* is, however, itself apparently

derived from the Syriac, and if there is any confusion, it has more likely been with ***kafar***, village (as in the familiar Capharnaoum), which is a very old word indeed.

In the same parable there is another expression which appears to be due to some confusion in the underlying text. Only three of the ten servants give an account of themselves, namely, the first, the second, and the last (apparently), only the last is not called the last, but "the other" (v. 20, ὁ ἕτερος). In the Semitic languages the same consonants *'chr* are used to do duty for our two words "other" and "last." Hence the LXX renders the same Hebrew word by ἔσχατος in Exodus iv., 8 and by ἕτερος in Deuteronomy xxix., 22 (21), in the Authorized Version "the generation to come." There is little doubt, therefore, that the "other" of v. 20 in Luke xix. should be "last."

A second source of confusion in regard to the same words is the close similarity, or indeed identity, in form of the letters *d* and *r* in the Hebrew script of the first century and earlier, so that words such as *'chr* in its various senses, and *'chd* ("one," or in the plural "few") are frequently misread for one another. Hence in II. Samuel vii., 23 the Hebrew has "one nation," the Greek "other nation": in Genesis xxii., 13 the Hebrew has "behold a ram behind" (*'achar*), the Greek "behold a (*'echadh*) ram": in Daniel xi.,

20 the Hebrew has "in a few days," the LXX "in the last days," Theodotion "in those days."

But there is still a third link to the chain. Matthew xxvii., 60, states that Joseph of Arimathæa laid the body of Jesus "in his new tomb." John xix., 41 also mentions a garden in which there was "a new tomb." Mark xv., 46 and Luke xxiii., 53 have merely "laid him in a tomb" (μνῆμα: Matthew and John have μνημεῖον), which they all further describe. There are no variant readings. How comes it that one Gospel has the word "new" and another appears to omit it? The cause of the difference is no doubt to be sought in the underlying Aramaic text, in which the word for "one" or "a" again bears a close resemblance to the word for "new." Consequently we find the one read for the other in the Old Testament, in Ezra vi., 4, where the Hebrew has "a row of *new* timber," which the LXX read "*one* row of timber,"—the same difference as we find in the Gospels in the places just cited. There are also other places in the New Testament in which the resemblance of these two words may have given rise to variation of reading in the MSS. or in the separate Gospels. Thus in Luke xxii., 20 we have "This cup is the *new* covenant in my blood," for which Matthew xxvi., 28 and Mark xiv., 24 have "This is my blood of the covenant." St. Paul (I. Corinthians xi., 25) agrees, as we might expect, with St. Luke. The word "new"

is also read in Matthew and Mark by the Codex A, and in Matthew also by the Codex Bezae. The words are an allusion to Exodus xxiv., 8, where Moses sprinkles the blood of the sacrifices over the people and says: "Behold the blood of the covenant" (quoted, Hebr. ix., 20). The insertion of the word "new" in the English Authorized Version in Matthew and Mark may be right or wrong. It makes explicit the contrast with the old, which in any case is implied. It may have been omitted by א and by B in order to conform to the Greek text of Exodus. The Revised Version places it in the margin; Westcott and Hort omit it; Von Soden retains it in Matthew only. One cannot help thinking that the original words were "This is a new covenant (sealed) by my blood" or "This is a covenant (sealed) by my blood," both which would be to all intents the same in Aramaic, the indefinite article in the former being unexpressed, as it usually it, but expressed in the latter by the same word as the numeral "one," as it very often is. In Mark xvi., 17, "they shall speak with new tongues," Westcott and Hort omit and Von Soden brackets the word "new," following the first hand of C. The Codex Alexandrinus has the word. In Acts ii., 4, the phrase is "to speak with *other* tongues": in x., 46, "to speak with tongues," and so xix., 6 and I. Corinthians, xii., 30; and so in xiv., 2, "speak in a tongue": in xii., 10, 28, "kinds of tongues." The phrase

" to speak with another tongue " occurs in Isaiah xxviii., 11. No doubt Mark xvi., 17, " new tongues " and Acts ii., 4, " other tongues " and x., 46, " tongues," all go back to the same Aramaic phrase, and arise out of the confusion of " new " with " one " and of " one " with " other," as indicated above.

The saying (Matthew xiii., 17), " Verily I say to you that many prophets and righteous men desired to see," etc., occurs also in Luke x., 24, with the omission of " verily," the use of another word for " desired," and " prophets and kings." The omission is characteristic of Luke; the use of a different verb may be simply an alternative rendering of the same Aramaic word, but what about the use of " kings " instead of " righteous men "? The two words have no resemblance in the Greek, nor do the ordinary Hebrew words for " king " and " righteous " at all resemble one another. There are, however, two possible explanations from Hebrew. The common Hebrew word for " righteous," *tsdyk,* could easily be confused with the word for judge, *ktsyn,* and the latter is rendered " king " by the LXX in Proverbs xxv., 15. Another possible explanation may be found in the Hebrew word *nadyb,* generous, which is rendered by " righteous " in the LXX of Proverbs xvii., 7, and by " king " in xix., 6 (3). If the latter explanation be the correct one, then this is not the only case in which this Hebrew

word has given rise to a variant between two Gospels. In Matthew iii., 9, the words of John the Baptist are "and think not to say within yourselves," but in Luke iii., 8 "and begin not to say within yourselves." This is possibly a case of scribal error in the Greek, but more likely the root of the discrepancy is to be found in the underlying Semitic text. In Exodus xxv., 2: xxxv., 21, 22, the LXX renders the Hebrew verb *nadab* by δοκεῖν, "to think" or "seem good." That is to say, where the Hebrew reads literally "whose heart made him generous," "whose spirit was generous," "generous of mind," the Greek has "to seem good to the heart, spirit, mind." On the other hand, in Isaiah xxxii., 5, "the churl shall no more be called noble" (*nadib*), for "noble" they have ἄρχειν, "to rule" or "begin." Both Greek words would therefore appear to be translations of the same Hebrew word, and the probable sense is, "Do not have the hardihood to say within yourselves." The same Greek words are interchanged again in Matthew xx., 25, "the rulers (Luke xxii., 25, kings) of the nations lord it over them," for which Mark x., 42 has, "they that are *accounted* to *rule* of the nations lord it over them," which seems to be a double translation of the Hebrew word *nadib,* prince. As we are upon this passage, it may be noted in passing that for "and they that are *great* exercise authority upon them" in the following clause of

Matthew and Mark, Luke has "and their authoritative ones are called Euergetai (benefactors)." The variation seems to be quite clearly due to some translator having read the common Hebrew word *gdl,* great, for the comparatively rare *gml,* benefactor, or the converse.

There is no word in Hebrew answering to the English possessive adjective "own." Where this word is found in the Old Testament it is inserted by the translators. "God made man in his own image" is in Hebrew "in his image" simply, and so throughout. Hence in our Greek Gospels, based upon a Hebrew or Aramaic text, we should expect to find one inserting the word "own" where another leaves it out. And this is what we do find. In the saying, "A prophet is not without honour save in his *own* country," the readings vary (Matthew xiii., 57: Mark vi., 4: Luke iv., 24: John iv., 44). So also Matthew xvi., 25: Mark viii., 35: Luke ix., 24: "whoever shall lose his (αὐτοῦ) or his own (ἑαυτοῦ) life." Other examples are Matthew xiii., 36, "his disciples," but Mark iv., 34b "his own disciples": Matthew xxvii., 31, "his garments," but in Mark xv., 20, "his own garments": Matthew xii., 33, "from the fruit the tree is known," but Luke vi., 44, "each tree from its own fruit is known: Matthew vii., 3, "the beam which is in thine eye," but Luke vi., 41, "the beam which is in thine *own* eye." Sometimes the word "own" is added, just as in the Old Testament,

where there is no parallel passage, Luke x., 34, "set him on his *own* beast." There would be no word answering to "own" in these sentences in Hebrew or Aramaic.

A considerable number of the variants in the Gospels are nothing more than different ways of turning a Hebrew phrase in Greek. Perhaps the most common instance is the variation of "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven" often referred to. It is well known that the latter expression is used only by St. Matthew, in whose Gospel it is found some twenty-eight times. In all the rest of the New Testament the former phrase alone is used, as it is also in Matthew. The word "heaven" here, or rather "the heavens," is simply a periphrasis for "God." Thus in Daniel iv., 26, "the heavens do rule," that is, God: I. Mac. iv., 55, "all the people . . . gave praise to heaven which had given them good success." "Heaven" is not used as an alternative for "God" in the oldest of the Aramaic Targums, but it is so used in the Talmud. In the tractate commonly known by the name of "The sayings of the Fathers," the saying ascribed to Antigonus of Socho is as follows: "Be not like slaves who serve their master with a view to a reward, but be like slaves who serve their master not with a view to a reward, and let the fear of Heaven be upon you." Wetstein on Matthew iii., 2 cites a number of instances of the use of the term "king-

dom of heaven" in post-Biblical literature. It will be noticed that it is the first Gospel which preserves, as we might expect, the literal form of the phrase. As to its import, the kingdom of God stands in contrast to the kingdom of man (Daniel iv., 17, 25, 32): "the Most High has authority over the kingdom of man." John Lightfoot has a good exposition of the phrase in his *Harmony of the Evangelists* on John iii., 3. Of Biblical occurrences of the two expressions, he gives: Matthew iv., 17, Repent for the kingdom of heaven (Mark i., 15, of God) is at hand: so Matthew xix., 14 and Mark x., 14: Matthew xiii., 33, and Luke xiii., 20; and others. Of examples of the extra-Biblical use of Heaven for God, he gives the following: A man should fear his teacher as he fears Heaven: to cast off the fear of Heaven: death by the hand of Heaven; and so forth; and he quotes Elias Levita as saying: They call God Heaven because heaven is the place of His habitation.

In the same way one of the Gospels may use a different construction to what is found in another. The verb "to say," for instance, is construed either with the dative or with πρός and the accusative. Examples are Matthew ix., 15 and Mark ii., 19 (dative), as contrasted with Luke v., 34: so Mark ii., 17 as compared with Luke v., 31; and often. The same variation is found in the LXX also: for example, Genesis iii., 9 and xv., 5, etc.

In Hebrew also the verb "to say" may be followed by the preposition denoting the dative or by that denoting direction.

It may be doubted whether any work of antiquity has suffered more at the hands of the copyists than has the Bible, at any rate the Old Testament. It would almost seem as if it were impossible to give these scriveners credit for too much stupidity and carelessness. Even the original Greek translators themselves in certain parts have executed their task in a very slovenly, not to say free and easy, way. In the Law the translation is done with great care and faithfulness, but even here we find liberties taken with the original Hebrew text. Thus in Leviticus xi., 6 and Deuteronomy xiv., 7 the hare is enumerated as among the unclean animals. The Greek for "hare" is λαγώς or λαγός. Lagos was, however, the family name of the rulers of Egypt, the country in which the Greek translation was made. The translators were too good courtiers, therefore, to say anything in disparagement of the hare. They therefore translate the word by δασύπους or "coney." Occasionally the translators appear to be trying to amuse themselves at the expense of their text. Thus in Isaiah xxvi., 14, the Hebrew says, "Dead men never live again, shades never rise." The Greek translators had, of course, no vowel-points to guide them, and without the vowels the word for "shades" may be read

"physicians." The translators accordingly render "physicians shall not rise," which may be true, but is not what the Hebrew author intended to say. One finds something of the same tendency to humour even in the English version. Thus one difficult place is Isaiah xxviii., 25, which runs, "he puts in wheat and barley." After the word "wheat," however, there is in the Hebrew text a word *sorah*, of which the meaning was not known, but which has since been found upon one of the Zingirli inscriptions as a kind of grain, probably millet. As, however, the word bore some resemblance to the word for "prince" (*sar*), the English translators wrote down "the principal wheat and barley."

The Greek translators of the Hebrew Bible were, we must remember, rendering one language which is read from right to left into one which is read from left to right. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that they sometimes forgot what they were doing and began reading the Hebrew backwards. Hence, instead of the Hebrew word "king" (*mlk*) in II. Samuel xix., 41 (40), the Codex Alexandrinus has "all the people" (*kl'm*), reading the word backwards. In Ezekiel xxxvii., 21, for "the sons of (*'th-bny*) Israel" the Greek has "the house of (*byth*) Israel." Any one will not read far without meeting with other examples better than these. The LXX translators seem even on occasion to have forgotten that it was

Hebrew they were reading and not Greek. Hence they render the Hebrew word for "valley" (*ge*) by the Greek γῆ, "land," for example, Ezekiel xxxii., 5. How easily words were misread for similar words in the MSS. of the time may be guessed from the LXX reading of the Hebrew, "Michal Saul's daughter loved him" (*mykhl bth sh'vl 'hbhthhv*) as "because all Israel loved him" (*ky khl ysr'l 'hbh 'thv*) in I. Samuel xviii., 28. It has also to be remembered that, while the LXX knew Hebrew, they were much more at home in Aramaic, in which they did most of their business and all their thinking. It is not surprising, therefore, to find them on occasion reading the Hebrew as if it were Aramaic. Like more than one New Testament writer, they were always thinking in Aramaic, and they did not always remember that it was not Aramaic they were reading. Thus in Micah i., 11 they take the noun "mourning" (*misped*) as an Aramaic infinitive (which begins with *m*), and again in iv., 3, "war" = "to fight": Zechariah iv., 7, etc.

It would only be what we might expect if we meet with variants in the Gospels, which are best explained as scribal errors on the part of those who translated out of the original Hebrew into Greek. The best possible kind of passage to demonstrate this would be one in which two accounts are identical except for a single expression, and this one divergence explicable only

from the Hebrew. Such a passage we find in the verse beginning, " No one can serve two masters " (Matthew vi., 24: Luke xvi., 13). This verse of twenty-seven words is identical in every word and letter in Matthew and Luke, with the exception of one point. After " no one " Luke inserts the word " servant " or domestic (οἰκέτης) There is no explanation forthcoming from the Greek, but as soon as we turn to the Hebrew the source of the difference becomes apparent. Οἰκέτης means in the Bible a bondslave: Ecclus. xxiii., 10, " a servant that is continually scourged shall not lack a bruise "; and the difference between the reading of Matthew and that of Luke in Hebrew is that between LA Y'BD and LA Y'BD 'BD. That is to say, the translator on whom the text of Luke is based has committed the common scribal error of reading three letters twice.

A somewhat less mathematical case occurs in the parable of the Sower. In Matthew xiii., 4, we read, " and in his sowing some fell by the way, and the fowls came and devoured it." Mark iv., 4 is identical, except that he puts in " it came to pass " and leaves out " his." Luke viii., 5 agrees with Matthew, but reads " fowls of heaven " and leaves out " came," and (the point which concerns us here) inserts before this " and was trodden down." This phrase is evidently a mistake, because the fate of these seeds was not to be trodden into the ground, but to be eaten by the

birds, and there is no use for it in the exposition of the parable (v. 12). The only question is, How did it get there? The answer would seem to be that it arose out of the resemblance of the Hebrew words for "way" and "tread," which are both DRK. Luke's translator read these letters twice. The same consonants have been similarly repeated in Psalm xlv., 4 (5), in which the "And (in) thy majesty" of the English versions and of the Hebrew text are the last five letters of the preceding verse (VHDRK) repeated over again. In Jeremiah li., 3 the same unfortunate letters have been written twice. The Hebrew text runs YDRK YDRK HDRK. The Hebrew scribes omitted the second YDRK. In neither of these two examples would the Aramaic serve, as its words for "slave" and "serve" do not resemble one another, nor those for "way" and "tread"; but Luke's omission of "came" and insertion of "heaven" and of "was trodden down" might have arisen out of a misreading of an Aramaic text.

Two words which are frequently confused with one another in the Hebrew Bible are the word for "poor" (ANY) and the word for "meek" (ANV), the word for "poor" being written in the text, but the word for "meek" read. Thus in Psalm ix., 19 the *kthibh* or consonantal text has "The hope of the meek perishes," but the *kre*, or the text as it is read, is "of the poor." The

Greek translators chose whichever reading they preferred. In Psalm lxix. (lxviii.), 33 the Hebrew has "meek," the Greek "poor": in Psalm xviii. (xvii.), 28, the Hebrew "poor," the Greek "humble." The reason for this confusion is that these two words, in the consonantal text, which alone, without the vowels, was written till long after the Christian Era, differ only in a single letter, and these two letters were, in the script in use about the beginning of the Christian Era, quite indistinguishable in form. We have apparently the same confusion in the Gospels in the first beatitude, Matthew's "poor in spirit" (v., 3) and Luke's "poor" (vi., 20) being readings of the one Hebrew word. Matthew xxi., 5, "meek and riding upon an ass," agrees with the LXX of Zechariah ix. 9. The Hebrew has "poor." The LXX adds "in spirit" to the Hebrew, *e.g.*, in Zechariah i., 6 = "commanded by my spirit."

When we remember how ancient MSS. were exposed to the weather and rough usage, we shall not wonder that many passages became so faded and rubbed as to be quite illegible. In these circumstances the scribes could only guess at the meaning. A good example of this in the Hebrew Bible is found in Psalm xiv., 5, 6, "There were they in great fear: for God is in the generation of the righteous. Ye have shamed the counsel of the poor, because the Lord is his refuge," and liii., 5,

"There were they in great fear, where no fear was: for God hath scattered the bones of him that encampeth against thee; thou hast put them to shame, because God hath despised them." Incredible as it may appear, these two texts are evident attempts to read sense into the same unintelligible Hebrew words. Perhaps something similar has occurred in some passages in the Gospels. In the account of the transfiguration, Matthew xvii., 2 has "His face shone as the sun," but Luke ix., 29, "the fashion of His face was another." These two bear as much resemblance in Hebrew, as do the two passages from the Psalms. *Cf.* Daniel iii., 19.

One of the largest classes of scribal errors to be found in the Bible consists of those connected with numbers. This is no doubt largely owing to the fact that the Hebrews used the letters of the alphabet to indicate the numerals, as is done on the coins and as is still done in printed Hebrew Bibles and other books. The same method of writing numbers is found in the Greek papyri also. In these the numbers are indeed in the case of literary compositions written out in full in words, but in legal and business documents they are represented by the letters of the Greek alphabet. Even, however, in Biblical fragments they are sometimes expressed by letters also. In the collection of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* edited by Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, No. 2, a fragment of the first

chapter of Matthew, the number 14 in v. 17 is indicated by IΔ. Its date is about the year 300. Similarly in No. 1073, a fragment of the Old Latin version of Genesis v. and vi., the ages of the patriarchs are expressed in Roman numerals, for example, 700 by *dcc.*, and so on. In No. 1230 (Revelation v., 5 to vi., 8), of the early fourth century, 7 is denoted by ζ.

The same method of indicating numbers is found in the text of the Greek Bible. In Judges xiv., 10, the LXX inserts "seven days" (ζ' ἡμέρας), but the most familiar example is the number of the Beast in Revelation xiii., 18, where there is a variant reading (616 and 666) due to the use of letters instead of words. Occasionally a scribe would read a letter as a numeral when it was not intended to be so taken. Thus in the Greek text of Leviticus xxvii., 5, the assessment to be put upon a girl who "makes a singular vow" is 14 shekels instead of 10 as in the Hebrew, the Greek scribe having taken the δ of the following δίδραχμα for the number 4, and so read δέκα τέσσερα. Again in II. Chronicles xvi., 13, for the Hebrew "and Asa died in the 41st year of his reign" the Greek Vaticanus has "in the 30th." The translators apparently took the *l* of the following Hebrew *lmolcho* for the number 30, which it also denotes.

We are told by the author of the first Gospel that the sum for which Judas betrayed his Master was 30 pieces of silver (xxvi., 15: xxvii., 3). Not

one of the other Gospels mentions this sum, nor does Luke in the Acts. When we recall that John thinks it worth while to set down the number of fish taken in one catch on the Sea of Galilee (xxi., 11), that both John and Mark state that the money value of the ointment poured over Jesus was 300 pence (John xii., 5: Mark xiv., 5), and that all four authors put down the exact quantity of broken pieces taken up after the feeding of the 5,000 (xiv., 20: vi., 43: ix., 17: vi., 13), it does seem strange that one alone of them should have taken the trouble to mention the terms on which their Master was at last given over into the hands of His enemies. No doubt we shall be told that this figure is recorded by Matthew alone because it fulfils an old oracle (Zechariah xi., 12), and the citation of ancient prophecies is a feature of his Gospel. But this explanation is ruled out by the fact that this is not the only place in which the number 30 is found in one authority and omitted by another. In the account of the great tree seen by Nebuchadnezzar in his dream (Daniel iv., 12 in the English versions), the LXX translators have the statement that its branches were in length "about 30 stadia." Again in the story of Bel and the Dragon (v. 27), the Greek version of Theodotion reads, "and Daniel took pitch," but that of the LXX "and Daniel took 30 pounds of pitch." We may be sure that whatever caused the insertion or omission of the number 30 in

these passages was also the cause of the omission or insertion of the 30 in the Gospels. The explanation is the same as that of the Vatican reading of "thirtieth" in II. Chronicles xvi., 13, mentioned above. The phrase used in Matthew xxvi., 15 runs, "and they weighed unto him thirty pieces of silver." "Silver" in Hebrew or Aramaic would be *keseph* or *kaspo*: the word "pieces" is not expressed (Genesis xx., 16: xxxvii., 28, etc.); and the "thirty" would simply be the letter *l*. The letter *l*, however, is used in late Hebrew and in Aramaic for the sign of the definite accusative case. The Aramaic *lkaspo* could therefore be read equally well as "thirty pieces of silver" or simply as "the silver" or "silver." Matthew read it in the former way, the rest of the narrators in the latter. This is also without any doubt the explanation of the variant versions of the LXX and of Theodotion in the story of Bel and the Dragon cited above; and in the passage from the book of Daniel the "about thirty stadia" is to be traced to the same source. The Hebrew text of this verse is difficult, but it contains the letter *kl*, and the translators took the *k* to mean "about" (as in Judges xx., 31, etc.), and the *l* to stand for 30. The translators of the Hebrew Bible and Apocrypha frequently forgot about the use of the letter *l* to mark the direct object. Thus in Ezra viii., 16, the English version, following the Greek (I. Esdr. viii., 43),

renders it "for." "Then sent I for Eliezer" instead of "Then sent I Eliezer." (The "sent" in the following verse should be "made them to go out.") The same thing occurs in I. Macc. iv., 24, where the "gave praise to heaven" of the Revised Version should be "blessed heaven," that is, "God" (*Cf.* R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha*, etc., *ad loc*).[3]

It is evident that, if we want to get the true sense of the specifically Christian terms employed in the New Testament, we must go back to the original Hebrew or Aramaic out of which they were got. A good example is an expression which does not indeed occur in the first three Gospels, nor in fact in the New Testament outside the Gospel and first epistle of John, the word "only-begotten." This expression has, under the influence of dogmatic theology, taken on a half-metaphysical, half-physiological meaning, which would have been quite unintelligible to Jesus and His disciples, and the use of which in the Christian Church might be discontinued with advantage from every point of view. It is taken from the Latin *unicus*, which is a rendering of the Greek μονογενής, which again comes from the Hebrew *yachidh*.

This Hebrew word, however, does not mean "only-begotten." It is used of Isaac (Genesis

[3] "Variant Numbers in the Gospels," in *The Expositor*, 1918, p. 232 ff.

xxii., 2, 12, 16), who was not even the first-born, and very far from being an only son (*cf.* Genesis xxv.). But we do not require to go back to the Hebrew. The Greek word μονογενής itself has not always the sense which the dictionaries give it. Thus Aquila and Symmachus use it of Isaac in the passages cited above, and so does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi., 17). So also does Josephus (*Ant.* I., xiii., 1), as he does also of Izates, prince of Adiabene, although he had a full brother older than himself, and other brothers besides (*Ant.* XX., ii., 1), whom Josephus mentions in the immediately preceding context: "He (Izates' father) had Monobazus, his elder brother, by Helena also, as he had other sons by other wives besides. Yet did he openly place all his affection on this, his only-begotten son, Izates" (so Whiston). But even the Latin *unicus* does not necessarily mean an *only* son. Thus in Plautus, *Captives,* Hegio speaks of one of his two sons as *unicus* (I., 147: *cf.* 150). And in the same way too, even in English, Aegeon in the *Comedy of Errors* calls one of his two sons his *only* son (V., i., 309). All this seems to show that when in the New Testament, that is in the Gospel and first Epistle of John (i., 14, 18: iii., 16, 18: iv., 9), Jesus is spoken of as the "only-begotten" son, this means no more than "best beloved." And hence the LXX translators of the Hebrew Bible render the Hebrew word *yachidh* in the

passages referred to above by ἀγατητός, as also in Judges xi., 34 (A): Jeremiah vi., 26: Amos viii., 10: Zechariah xii., 10; and as the English version also rightly translates the feminine (Psalms xxii., 20: xxxv., 17).

As there is no doubt that the Greek of the Gospels is largely diluted with Hebrew, it is allowable to suppose that phrases which are characteristic of Hebrew which are found in them, are real Hebraisms, even when these phrases are found outside of Judæo-Greek. Thus it seems to be common to many languages to insert an auxiliary verb, such as "to go," in statements in which it is purely otiose. This is very common in the Hebrew Bible. Thus we have:—

"answered and said" where no question has been asked: Luke v., 31: ix., 49: Matthew xxvi., 63. This usage is especially common in the Aramaic of Daniel: in Job it is in place.

"to go": Matthew ix., 13, "Go and learn": xxv., 16, "he went and traded": Luke xv., 15, "he went and joined himself to a citizen," and elsewhere. And so in the Old Testament, Deuteronomy xxxi., 1, "Moses went and spoke": Numbers xxiv., 25, "Balaam rose up and went and returned." This is found in colloquial Greek: "I have gone and borrowed money from a fellow soldier" (B. G. U., III., 814, 27f.).

"to take": "David took and ate the shew-bread," Luke vi., 4; where Matthew xii., 4 and

Mark ii., 26, omit "took and": "leaven which a woman took and hid," Matthew xiii., 33: Luke xiii., 21: so in the Old Testament, II. Samuel xviii., 18, "Absalom had taken and reared up to himself a pillar," and so frequently.

"to rise": Genesis xxii., 3, "Abraham rose up early and saddled his ass . . . and rose up and went": Bel 37, "arise and eat": Matthew xxiv., 43, "would have arisen (English "watched") and not permitted his house," where Luke xii., 39 omits the colloquialism: Luke xiii., 25, "the master of the house is risen up and hath shut to the door": xv., 18, "I will arise and go."

Other phrases which are in all likelihood Hebrew are:—"Lift up his eyes to heaven," Luke xviii., 13: "lift up voice," xvii., 13: "birds of heaven," Matthew viii., 20: Mark iv., 32: Luke ix., 58: "clouds of heaven," Matthew xxiv., 30, where Mark xiii., 26 and Luke xxi., 27 omit "of heaven": "sheep of pasture," Matthew xxvi., 31, where Mark xiv., 27 omits "of pasture": "son of peace," Luke x., 6: "slumbered and slept," Matthew xxv., 5: "daughters of Jerusalem," Luke xxiii., 28: the constant use of "Behold" and the use of 7 and 70 as round numbers: "What is to me and to you?" meaning "What have you to do with me?" Matthew xxvii., 19: Mark i., 24: v., 7: Luke viii., 28: John ii., 4: "to the face of" for "before," Luke ii., 31, "which Thou hast prepared to the face of all people": "every" in the

sense of "any," Luke i., 37, "with God not every thing is impossible": so the LXX and Theodotion render Daniel ii., 10, "no king asketh at every magician": so iii., 28 (95): iv., 6 (9) (Theodotion): the use of the "generic article," Matthew viii., 23, "the ship" for "a ship": xiii., 44, "the field" for "a field": so xxv., 32, "the shepherd": Mark iii., 13, "the mountain": the use of the positive for the comparative, Luke v., 39, "old wine is good," that is, "better": hence Matthew xx., 25, 26 have "great" for "greater" in Luke xxii., 26: in the Old Testament lepers are cleansed, not healed or cured, and so in the Gospels, Luke xvii., 14, and often: the contrary in the "Preaching of Peter."

After all is said and done, there will always remain some cases of variants between the Gospels which will prove insoluble. Why, for instance, in the verse quoted in the first lecture—Matthew xii., 28 and Luke xi., 20—should Matthew say "spirit" and Luke "finger?" Matthew is not trying to avoid an anthropomorphism, for even the author of the Targum Onkelos sees no harm in speaking of the "finger of God," Exodus xxxi., 18: Deuteronomy ix., 10; though he does change the word in Exodus viii., 19 (15), "this destruction is of God."

LECTURE V

Miscellaneous passages—summary.

Titles.—It may be noted that the preposition κατά in the titles of the first three Gospels may mean "according to the translation of" Matthew, etc., just as in the titles of the Greek versions of Daniel, etc.

Matthew iii., 11: "whose shoes I am not worthy to bear"—the same Greek word as in "a man bearing a pitcher of water," Mark xiv., 13 and Luke xxii., 10. The words of John, however, in Luke iii., 16 and John i., 27 are "whose shoe latchet I am not worthy to unloose." Mark, as so often, adds an additional touch, and writes "worthy to *stoop down* and unloose." In all probability Matthew has the original reading. The Greek word for "bear" answers regularly to the Hebrew *nasa'*. In Job xlii., 9, however, this Hebrew word is translated by the LXX by λύειν, to unloose. The Hebrew of this verse means literally "raised the face of Job": the LXX translates "loosed sin to them through Job." Whatever may have led the LXX to take the Hebrew word "to carry" in the sense of "to unloose" in the

verse in Job, may also have led the source used by Mark, Luke, and John to take it in that sense here. They may also have been influenced by the words of Abraham to the King of Sodom, "from a thread to a shoe latchet." This saying of John, therefore, would appear to have passed through four editions or stages of development, namely, (1) to carry his shoes; (2) to unloose his shoes; (3) to unloose the latchet of his shoes; and (4) to stoop down and unloose the latchet of his shoes (Mark). *Cf.* also Acts xiii., 25.

Matthew v., 3 = Luke vi., 20: This variant has been mentioned above, but will bear a second consideration. As has been said in the fourth lecture, Matthew's "poor in spirit" and Luke's "poor" are probably nothing more than a reflexion of the not uncommon confusion that is found in the Hebrew Bible between the words for "poor" and "meek." In these cases, the alternative reading is put in the margin of the English Revised Version (Psalm ix., 12, 18, etc.). In the present case, the original word may have been either "poor" or "meek," but as the meek are mentioned in v. 5 (which in some versions and MSS., D amongst others, comes next to v. 3), we are therefore shut up to the argument "poor" of Luke. The argument that the difference, "poor" and "poor in spirit" is to be explained by the fact that Matthew is generally more spiritual and Luke

more literal (for example, "hunger and thirst after righteousness" for "hunger" in Luke vi., 21) does not always hold good. In regard to almsgiving, the difference between the two evangelists is that, whereas Luke enjoins the giving of alms (xi., 41: xii., 33), in Matthew it is taken for granted and only the *method* of giving dealt with (vi., 1, 2, 4). But after all the difference is not very great, for, as the wise David Kimchi says in his commentary on the Psalms, the meek and the poor will always be more or less the same people (Psalm ix., 13).

There is, however, a further difference between the first and the third Gospel, Luke having the second person, "blessed are ye poor," for Matthew's third. This difference of person is in Hebrew a matter of a single letter, and is common enough in the Hebrew Bible. Thus in Deuteronomy iii., 20, in some texts "giving to you" is read for the written "giving to them."

Matthew v., 7: "Blessed are the merciful": this might also mean "Blessed are they who like other people, for they shall be liked." In Psalm xviii., 1 (2), "I will love thee, O Lord," the word translated "love" everywhere else means to "pity." In Syriac, however, the word to "love" is the same as the Hebrew "pity."

Matthew v., 11: "for my sake": Luke vi., 22, "for the son of man's sake." This variant would

give countenance to the belief of Beza (d. 1605) and John Cock of Leyden (d. 1669), vulgarly known as Joannes Cocceius, that the term "son of man" was used in Aramaic as a periphrasis for the pronoun of the first person singular. So Matthew viii., 20 and Luke ix., 58, "the son of man hath not where to lay his head," that is, "I have not." Also, xvi., 13, "Whom do men say that the son of man is?" but Mark viii., 27 and Luke ix., 18, "that I am"; and elsewhere.

Matthew v., 20: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees." The Greek word for righteousness is δικαιοσύνη, which is the equivalent of the Hebrew *tsedek* or *tsedaka,* and no doubt this, or its Aramaic equivalent, was the word actually used by Jesus. In His time, however, this word had largely lost its general meaning of "righteousness," and had become restricted to one special manifestation of righteousness, namely, almsgiving, or, in the concrete, alms. This post-classical meaning of *tsedaka* was known to the LXX translators of Deuteronomy, that is, as early as the middle of the third century, B.C., for they render it by ἐλεημοσύνη at Deuteronomy vi., 25: xxiv., 13. In the Psalms ἐλεημοσύνη is always the rendering of *tsedaka*—xxiv. (xxiii.), 5: xxxiii. (xxxii.), 5: ciii. (cii.), 6: as also Isaiah i., 27: xxviii., 17: lix., 16 —or of *tsedek,* xxxv. (xxxiv.), 24. In Isaiah

xxxviii., 18, it is the equivalent of *emeth* (truth), like the corresponding Arabic word *sidk* (truth). In Proverbs it always stands for *chesed* (mercy), as also in Genesis xlvii., 29. In Daniel it answers to *tsidka*—iv., 27 (24)—which clearly means "almsgiving," or to *tsedaka,* ix., 16. In the Mishnah *tsedaka* means "alms" (Sayings of the Fathers, V., 13), as also in the Nabatæan inscriptions (*Cf. Studia Biblica,* 1885, p. 212, l. 3). In Arabic one of the two words for alms is the same Hebrew word transliterated, as it is also in Syriac.

Thus at the time of Jesus this Hebrew word, which at first denoted righteousness in general, had become narrowed to the meaning of almsgiving, exactly as our word "charity" has done; and it seems clear that the words of Matthew v., 20 mean "Except your *alms* exceed those of the scribes and Pharisees. *Cf.* xix., 21: Mark xii., 44: Luke xi., 41: xii., 33. It is also possible that Jesus may here have followed a common practice of His and used the word in both senses at once (*cf.* Matthew viii., 22).[1] Additional point is given to this saying by the fact that it was the Pharisees who, when they came into power some century and a half earlier, had given almsgiving so large a place in the religious life.

Matthew vi., 1: The Revised Version translates literally, "Take heed that ye do not your *right-*

[1] See p. 144.

eousness before men," following the MSS. and modern editors, and cuts off this verse from verse 2; but the translators of the Authorized Version, following their intuition, render rightly "alms."

Matthew vii., 23: "Depart from me ye that work iniquity." This sentence occurs again in Luke xiii., 27, and the only motive for mentioning it is that it is a good type of a variant common in the Gospels. In the Greek every important word is different in the two reports, but as soon as the two are turned back, using the vocabulary of the LXX, into Aramaic, they become identical.

Matthew viii., 9: The centurion says he is a man "under authority," but the explanation which follows shows that what he means is that he is a man *in* authority. The Semitic word for authority, abstract or concrete, is *sultán*—Joseph was Sultan in Egypt (Genesis xlii., 6)—and the verb means, not to put under authority, but to make Sultan. There can be little doubt that what the centurion really said was, "I am a man in authority." This is more fitting to a Roman.

Matthew viii., 28: "there met him two possessed with devils": This is one of a number of places in which we find a dual in one Gospel taking the place of a singular in another. In this story of the herd of swine, both Luke (viii., 27) and Mark (v., 2) speak of one demoniac only, and

there is no doubt that it is the same incident that is being recorded by all three. According to Matthew xx., 30, there were two blind men healed near Jericho, according to Luke xviii., 35 and Mark x., 46, one only, and the three narratives seem to describe the same incident. In the narrative of the resurrection, the women in two of the accounts see only one angel (Matthew xxviii., 5) or one youth (Mark xvi., 5f.) at the sepulchre: in the other two there are two men (Luke xxiv., 4) or two angels (John xx., 12). The narratives are not mutually contradictory, but they do not suggest one another like the saying in Matthew x., 29, "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?" which in Luke xii., 6 takes the form, "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings?" There does not appear to be any way of reconciling these discrepancies or of accounting for their origin on the basis of the Greek text alone, and we are forced to look for the disturbing element in the Hebrew or Aramaic archetype. A good example is found in Matthew xi., 2, where the Authorized Version reads that John sent "two of his disciples," but the Revised Version, following the oldest uncial MSS., sent "by his disciples." The parallel passage in Luke vii., 18 has "certain two of his disciples." The word "certain," however, is left out by the Codex Bezae. The variation might be explained as due to a confusion in the Greek between "two" (*δύο*) and "by" (*διά*), not in the uncial MSS., in

which they are not very similar, but while the text was still in the papyrus stage, in which the small letters were used; but more likely the different Greek expressions are alternative renderings of a common Hebrew or Aramaic text. In the Semitic languages the direct object is often made the instrument of the action; for instance, Lamentations i., 17, "Zion spreadeth forth her hands," literally, "with her hands." This is done especially with the verb "to send" in Arabic. The Semitic original would then run "sent by his disciples." The word for "by" is the single letter *b*; but this letter has also the numerical value 2. The one Greek reading renders it "by," the other "two."

Perhaps the most curious variation connected with the number 2 occurs in the warning to Peter, that before the cock crew, he should deny his Master thrice (Matthew xxvi., 34: Luke xxii., 34: John xiii., 38). In Mark xiv., 30 this takes the remarkable form "before the cock crow *twice*, thou shalt deny me thrice." This is the reading of A, B, and C (second hand); but ℵ and C (first hand), and D omit the word "twice." But we are not, however, left here to the mercy of the MSS. The passage forms the text of a very old papyrus in the Collection of the Austrian Archduke Rainer (No. 541 in the *Fuehrer* edited by Karabacek). Wessely, in the descriptive notes to the Greek papyri in the Collection, regards this fragment as

a translation of sayings of Jesus drawn up by the apostle Matthew in Aramaic, and so more primitive than the canonical Gospels themselves. A discussion of this remarkable document will be found in the *Mittheilungen* to the Rainer papyri, I., 53ff. and V., 78ff., by G. Bickell. The text runs as follows (the words in parentheses being supplied):

> " (Jesus said after they had) eaten according to custom, A(ll you this) night shall be offend(ed according to) the writing, I will smite the (shepherd and the) sheep shall be scat(tered. Sayin)g Pet. Even if all, no(t I. He said, Not) shall the cock twice cr(ow before you d)en(y me thrice)."

This version of the saying has been defended on the ground that in Palestine there are two hours of the night at which cocks crow. On the other hand, the old authority on such subjects, *The Land and the Book,* maintains that the cocks crow there all night long (Chap. 43 at the end). But the only question which concerns the present purpose is, How did the " twice " get into the text of Mark and of the papyrus, or, if genuine, how did it come to fall out of the other two sources? It is difficult to think of anything that would account for either accident happening, unless Mark's irrepressible *penchant* for improving on his sources. Perhaps a scribe copied by mistake the first letters of the Aramaic word for " cock " (*tarnegol*) twice, and

the *trn* was taken for the word for "two" (*tren*). Another possibility lies in the fact that the Hebrew for "before" is either *terem* or *bterem*, and the *b* of the second form may have been taken for the number 2, which it also denotes—just as the Greek translator of Genesis xxv., 9 and other passages appears to have taken the initial *b* of the Hebrew word for "sons" (*banim*) for "two" as well as the first letter of the word. It lends some support to this suggestion that a similar misreading would account for the cases mentioned above, in which we have a dual in one Gospel answering to a singular in another. The Hebrew words for "to meet" and "to see" are sometimes construed with the accusative (Exodus v., 20: Genesis i., 4, etc.) and sometimes with the preposition *b* (Genesis xxxii., 2: xxxiv., 1, etc.). In the latter case it was always open to the Greek translator to read the preposition as the number 2, the verb taking the direct accusative. This may have happened in the case of the apparitions at the sepulchre, and in the narrative of the herd of swine referred to above. The case of the healing of the blind at Jericho is more difficult, as, besides the question of the number of men (two or one), there are other discrepancies. It has to be noted, however, that in Hebrew and the related languages similar events are related in the same words. A good example of this in the Hebrew Bible is found in the two occasions on which David spared the life of Saul

(I. Samuel xxiv. and xxvi.), which were lately regarded as nothing more than two accounts of the same incident. The two narratives in the Gospel, therefore, need not refer to the same event. But to return once more to the crowing of the cock. "Before the cock crow" is an oriental figure of speech for "in a short time." It is used by the Arabian poet Labid (about 600 A.D.) in his *Moallakah*, l. 61: "I anticipate the cock in my first draught of wine at the dawn, that my second may be when the sleepers stir." All Jesus meant to say was, "You will ere long deny me thrice." The words were fulfilled to the letter, but Mark alone takes the saying itself literally.

The whole story of the herd of swine is curious. The scene is laid in the first Gospel in the country of the Gadarenes, and the word for "herd," ἀγέλη, is used to translate the Hebrew *gedérah* in I. Samuel xxiv., 3. In v. 31 the demons beg to be sent "into the herd of swine," but in Mark v., 10, "not to be sent out of the district," and in Luke viii., 31 not to be sent "into the Abyss." The Abyss in Hebrew is *tehóm* (Genesis i., 2, etc.), and the "district" seems to point to *techóm*, which was used in the first century for the boundaries of a township. If the presumed Aramaic source had read "limits of Gadarah," one could see how all three readings arose. In Luke the possessed person comes "out of the city," but in Mark he comes, and in Matthew the two come, "out of the

tombs." This would seem to be the result of a confusion between the Aramaic *kirya* (city) and *kibra* (tomb). Swine and tombs are associated in Isaiah lxv., 4.

Matthew x., 11: "and into whatsoever city or village ye shall enter": The parallel passage Luke ix., 4, for "city or village" has simply "house," and so also Mark vi., 10. The occasion is the same in all three Gospels, and the words must originally have been the same also. It is, however, impossible to reduce the Greek variants to a common denominator. We must, therefore, have recourse to a presumed Hebrew or Aramaic original. In these the word for "house" is regularly *beth*. The Greek word for "village" frequently in the LXX is used to translate the Hebrew *bath* (daughter) in such phrases as "and the villages thereof" after the name of some city (Numbers xxi., 32). The words "house" and "village" may thus have arisen out of the same Hebrew word. The word for "city" again, besides answering to the Hebrew words for "city" or "town," is also used to render those for "land" (Numbers xxi., 31), "mountain" (II. Chronicles xxi., 11), "king" (Joshua xxiv., 12), the proper name of a town (Jeremiah lii., 13), or some misreading or corruption of the Hebrew text. In one or two places it is used to translate the Hebrew word for "house" (*beth*): Joshua xv., 10, "city

of the sun" for Bethshemesh: II. Chronicles viii., 11, "city of David" for the Hebrew "house of David"; and sometimes stands apparently for the shortened Aramaic form *be* (Deuteronomy xx., 11: Zechariah viii., 21, etc.). In Judges viii., 32 and I. Kings ii., 6, 9, it is a scribal error for πολιός, "hoary." It would thus appear that the three words, house, village, and city, in the passage of the Gospels cited above all go back to a common Aramaic "house." The point is not altogether unimportant, as it tends to show that the mission of the twelve, instead of being a public affair, as one would suppose from the Greek text of Matthew, was in reality a private house to house business, as indicated in the second and third Gospels.

Matthew x., 29: "One of them (the sparrows) shall not fall to the ground without your father" gives us the impression that the sparrow falls *dead,* and this appears to be the meaning of the Greek also. The Greek word answers to the Hebrew *nafal.* This again has not only the different senses of the English verb "to fall," but it has also the special meaning of to *alight.* Rebekah alighted (literally, fell) from her camel (Genesis xxiv. 64), and Naaman from his chariot (II. Kings, v., 21). The saying of Jesus would therefore mean that a sparrow does not even *alight* on the ground without God.

Matthew xi., 7: "And these departing," but Luke vii., 24, "and the messengers going away." The difference may be due to a confusion between the Aramaic *'lkh* (these, Ezra iv., 21, etc.) and *ml'kh* (messenger).

Matthew xi., 19: "Wisdom is justified of her works." Such is the reading of the Codex Sinaiticus and the first hand of B and the Peshitto, and it is accepted by Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort, and the Revised English Version. The reading "of her children" is found in the second hand of B, in the Codex Bezae, the Vulgate, the Old Syriac (Curetonian and Sinai Palimpsest), and is that of the English Authorized Version, and of the parallel verse in Luke vii., 35.

The only question that concerns us is, How did the variant reading come about? Lagarde proposed the Aramaic *'bdy'*, which might mean either "works" or "slaves," and compares 4 Esd. vii., 64 where the Latin has *operibus,* the Ethiopic "sons," and the Syriac "servants" (cited by A. H. M'Neile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*). This, however, is not likely, as, although the LXX render the Hebrew word for "slave" by παῖς (boy), they never translate by τέκνον (child). The LXX indeed themselves furnish the answer to the riddle. In I. Samuel vi., 7, for the Hebrew "two milch kine on which there hath come no yoke," they have "kine *without*

children." This is an evident confusion between the Hebrew word *'olel* or *'olal* (child) and the words *'ol* (yoke), *'al* (on) and *'alah* (come). The Hebrew word for "work," therefore, will be one which could easily be confused with *'olel* and *'olal*, that is to say, it was *'lilah* or *ma'lal*. These words are all so much alike in Hebrew that they could easily be mistaken for one another, and the LXX do in fact confuse them elsewhere (*cf.* Job xxiv., 12: xxxi., 10: probably 4 Macc. xiv., 13).

Matthew xii., 15: "He healed them all." The English version of the Gospels speaks very frequently of people being "healed" of their diseases, but constantly the Greek word so rendered is, not ἰᾶσθαι, but θεραπεύειν, which means rather to minister to or attend on the sick. In the Hebrew Bible it is never used by the LXX to translate the Hebrew *rafa*, which means to "heal." Only in Ecclus. xxxviii., 7 is it so used, and this is perhaps a reflection upon the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus. Whatever, therefore, the authors of the Gospels may have meant in such passages, they do not *say* that all the sick were healed.

Matthew xiii., 33: "leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal." "Took and hid" is a rare Hebraism (*cf.* p. 113). But why *hid*? The Greek verb usually means to "hide in a thing," but in Ezekiel iv., 12 it is used by the LXX to render the Hebrew verb "to bake," and

they regularly translate the corresponding noun meaning a "cake" by the cognate noun ἐγκρυφίας. The natural English equivalent, therefore, of the Hebrew at any rate would be "leaven which a woman took and *baked* in three measures of meal."

Matthew xxiv., 16: "Let him that is on the house-top not come down." Mark xiii., 15 adds explicitly, "and go into the house," which is left to be understood in Matthew. Luke xxi., 21 runs "and let not those within her (Jerusalem) go out, nor those without go in." The whole of this seems to have originated in Luke making the initial error of mistaking the Hebrew word for roof (*gag*) for the Aramaic word for inside (*gaw*). If so, he or his translator was reading Hebrew and thinking in Aramaic, like the LXX translators of the Hebrew Bible.

Matthew xxiv., 43: "And *that* know, that if the goodman of the house." Luke xii., 39 has "and *this* know." "This" and "that" are interchangeable in Aramaic. A Syrian, speaking English, would say "This is it" instead of "That's it." Matthew's "watch" and Luke's "hour" are both used to translate the same Hebrew, as also are the two Greek words for "suffered."

Matthew xxv., 34: "Then shall the king say": No king has been mentioned, and the word comes

in abruptly. The word for "king" (*mlk*) is often confused with that for "angel" (*ml'k*), and in Daniel ii., 11, the Hebrew "God" is rendered by the LXX "angel." Further examples are:—Book of Enoch, lxvii., 13, "angels" for "kings": lxix., 4, "angels" for "God": I. Esdras i., 24 (26), where the LXX has "king of Egypt" for the Hebrew "messengers" (the same word as "angels") in the parallel II. Chronicles xxxv., 21: *cf.* also Ecclus. xlviii., 8. *Cf.* Matthew x., 32, "before my father in heaven," and Luke xii., 8, "before the angels of God."

Mark ii., 23: In the account of the walk through the corn fields on the Sabbath day, as given in in Matthew xii., 1, the disciples "began to pluck the ears and to eat": in Luke vi., 1 also they "were plucking and eating, rubbing them in their hands": in Mark ii., 23, on the other hand, they "began to make a way, plucking the ears." Hence the complaint of the Pharisees would be, in the first Gospel, that the disciples were guilty of reaping on the Sabbath: in the third, that they were reaping and grinding: but in the second, that they were "making a road" on the Sabbath. The last objection would be quite in keeping with the intricate logic of the Hebrew casuistical system. It is, nevertheless, rejected by some scholars of the highest standing as out of place. The only question which concerns us at present is, How, if

they are not genuine, did the words get there? The Greek text does not supply us with any clue to their origin. It is only when we go back to the supposed Hebrew original, that light appears in our path, and the riddle would seem to be capable of solution. The Hebrew word for "ears of corn" is *shibbóleth*—the word which was propounded to the Ephraimites by the men of Gilead in order to test their tribal affinity (Judges xii., 6). The word *shibbóleth* is given, however, in a number of places in the Hebrew Bible, namely, Psalm lxix., 2 (floods) and 15 (waterflood) and Isaiah xxvii., 12 (channel), the sense of channel or current of a river: similarly Ecclus. iv., 26, "force not the current of the river." It may be doubted whether in all these cases the word has not been (as frequently happens in the Hebrew text) wrongly vowelled, and whether we should not read the common late Hebrew and Aramaic word for "a way," *shebhilah*. In Hebrew or Aramaic letters the two would be identical. However that may be, these two words are confused with one another in Ecclus. v., 9 (11), "Go not in every way," where the Hebrew has *shibbóleth* and the Syriac *shebhil*. This is just the error which has occurred in Mark ii., 23, only that there some copyist has rendered the word twice, first as "ears of corn" and then as "a way." It may also be noted in passing that the scribe of Mark appears to have thought that there were *paths* made through the corn fields in

Palestine, whereas people merely walk through the fields of corn (*Cf*. Tristram, *Nat. Hist.*).

Mark vi., 36: the disciples bid Jesus "dismiss the crowds" in Matthew xiv., 15: "dismiss the crowd" in Luke ix., 12; but "dismiss *them*" in Mark, although the persons referred to have not been mentioned immediately before. How did the variant arise? We have something similar in the LXX, for they translate "the son of Hinnom" in Jeremiah xix., 2 "*their* children," that is, they mistook the name Hinnom for the possessive pronoun "their." This is evidently what has happened in the Gospels. The Aramaic word for "crowd" is *hamon,* and the word for "them" is *himmon.* Both, written as they were without vowels, would be identical. Matthew and Luke read the letters in one way, Mark in the other. The same thing has occurred again in v. 41, where Mark has "them" for the "crowds" of Matthew and Luke.

Mark vii., 28: "nevertheles the whelpes also eate under ye table, of ye childrens crommes": so Miles Coverdale (1535). This is one of those passages which commentators pass by on the other side. The difficulty is duly noted in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,* I., 64. It is twofold. In the first place, dogs in the East are wild animals, and fairly large. In the second place, the Eastern table, when there is one, is no more than

some five or six inches high. It is true that the Talmud, in addition to the ordinary pariah dog, which is compared to a wolf, mentions a smaller sort, called a Kufri dog, of about the size of a jackal (Kil., c. i., etc.). The name Kufri is variously derived from the island of Cyprus or from *kefr*, a village. But, however that may be, this dog is said to have been even more ferocious than the larger type, and all the evidence, both native and European, points to the domestic dog being in Syria a thing unknown. Canon Tristram, indeed, states that he "found no difficulty in making a pet of a puppy, taken from among the pariah dogs" (*Nat. Hist.*, p. 80); but in the verse from Mark, the dog as a household pet is taken to be a thing of everyday occurrence, unworthy of remark, like the "table dogs" of the Greeks. Indeed, it has been suggested that Mark may have had the Greek custom in his mind when he wrote.

Another possible solution is that the correct text is that preserved in Matthew xv., 27, "the dogs eat of the crumbs *which fall* from their masters' table," and that Mark misread some word meaning "to fall" as some other word meaning "under." There is not much likelihood of the one *Greek* word having been mistaken for the other; but the Hebrew *lmth*, "under" (Eccl. iii., 21) and *mwt* (Psalm cxl., 11), which the LXX renders by πίπτειν, although they do not look much alike, might easily be mistaken for one another, and still more the

Aramaic *tchwth,* "under," and *tchwth,* "fall." There does not appear, however, to be any example in the LXX of a confusion between these particular words.

Mark xi., 22: "Have a faith of God," that is, a faith like God's: Matthew xxi., 21, "If ye have faith and doubt not." This seems to be a variant translation from the Hebrew *ribh,* doubt, and *rabh,* lord. The latter became the common word for "the Lord," of God in Arabic, but not in Hebrew. The LXX translates *ribh* by the word used by St. Matthew in Deuteronomy xxxiii., 7, "Let his hands decide for him." The New Testament use of this verb is peculiar (see *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*).

Mark xiii., 30: "Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass, until all these things be done." This verse occurs word for word and letter for letter the same in Matthew xxiv., 34 and Luke xxi., 32, except that Matthew omits "that" and Luke omits "these," and for "until" Mark has *μέχρις οὗ,* but the other two *ἕως ἄν.* These points may seem small matters, but the last is interesting, because the Hebrew word for "until" is translated in the LXX sometimes as in Mark (Joshua iv., 23) and sometimes as in the other two (Genesis xxiv., 19). Also in Daniel xi., 36 Theodotion renders as Mark, and the LXX as the other two. Matthew

also has "all these" and Mark literally "these all," Matthew's being the Hebrew order. The words were certainly spoken in Aramaic, and in that dialect all three witnesses are in perfect agreement.

Mark xv., 25: "and it was the third hour." It seems to be quite impossible to reconcile this with John xix., 14, "about the sixth hour." One can only suppose that one of the numerals represents the error of a scribe or translator. Such slips are very common in the Greek Old Testament as compared with the Hebrew. Perhaps the number which is most frequently misread is the 8 in connection with the word for "year," on account of the near resemblance of these two words in Hebrew. Sometimes the variation is in the Greek MSS., and sometimes in parallel passages of the Hebrew Bible itself, for example, as between Kings and Chronicles. Thus in Genesis ii., 2, the Greek reads "sixth" for the first "seventh" of the Hebrew: in Judges xix., 8, A has "third," B "fifth": in II. Chronicles xxix., 17, the Greek varies between "first" and "third" of the month and between "thirteenth" and "sixteenth": in Daniel vii., 1, Theodotion reads "third" for "first": and so in Luke iii., 1, "fifteenth" *may* be merely a slip for "thirteenth": *cf.* also Daniel x., 1, and elsewhere.

It is curious how frequently, when a number is

given in one Gospel and omitted in another, the letters representing that number would occur in their proper place in the text if it were translated back into Hebrew or Aramaic. Thus in Mark iv., 20 we have "bring forth fruit in thirty and in sixty and in a hundred" (similarly Matthew xiii., 23), for all which Luke viii., 15 has "bring forth fruit *in patience.*" The expression "in patience" in Aramaic would contain the letters whose numerical values are 30, 60, and (in the Greek notation) 100.

We have seen above that a Greek copyist could mistake an initial δ for the numeral 4 (Leviticus xxvii., 5). A corresponding slip would be very much more likely to occur in Aramaic than in Greek, for in it the fourth letter of the alphabet, besides having the numerical value 4, is also very widely used as a relative and possessive participle, occurring, indeed, on almost every line. This might account, for instance, for the omission by all the narrators other than John to mention that there were *four* soldiers at the Cross, and that Jesus' garment was divided into four shares (xix., 23).

Luke vi., 9: "to save life or to destroy?" Mark iii., 4 has "to save life or to kill?" The same variant translation occurs in Daniel ii., 24, "Destroy not the wise men," as between the LXX and Theodotion.

Luke vi., 26: "Woe (unto you) when all men shall speak well of you." The Greek καλῶς εἴπωσιν ὑμᾶς seems to be a literal translation of a Hebrew phrase which occurs in Genesis xxxvii., 4, "they could not speak peaceably to him," the only case in which the Hebrew verb "to speak" takes the direct accusative of the person spoken to, instead of a preposition. Perhaps, therefore, we should render "Woe, when all men speak you fair."

Luke xiv., 12, 13: When you make a feast, "do not invite your friends," but "invite the poor." The usual word for to "invite" to a feast is in the Gospels καλεῖν, and in the Papyri ἐρωτᾶν (Matthew xxii., 3ff.: I. Corinthians x., 27: and the preceding verses in Luke: Milligan, *Selections,* Nos. 23 and 39); but here the word is φωνεῖν, which properly means "to shout," "call aloud." The English version gets over the difficulties very neatly by rendering "call" instead of their usual "bid." In Hebrew, as in English, the same word which means "to shout, call out" also means in some places to invite guests (I. Samuel ix., 22). In the former sense it is rendered in the LXX of Jeremiah xvii. 11: Daniel iv., 11 (also Theodotion): v. 7 by φωνεῖν, and in the present passage the original translator would appear from inadvertence to have used the same word.

Luke xiv., 35: "neither is it fit for the ground nor yet for the dunghill." The apparent agri-

cultural reference is erroneous. The same terms are used in I. Samuel ii., 8: "He raiseth the poor out of the dust, and lifteth the beggar from the dunghill." Also Psalm cxiii. (cxii.), 7. "Neither in the dust nor in the dunghill," therefore, simply means "nowhere," like the phrase "shut up or left" (I. Kings xiv., 10, etc.), that is, anyone at all.

Luke xvi., 23: "lifted up his eyes, being in torments." The being in torment does not seem to be an appropriate cause for having the eyes cast down. The Greek expression is employed by the LXX to render various Hebrew terms, and, amongst others, in Ezekiel xvi., 52, 54, *klimmah*, "shame." We should, therefore, perhaps render "lifted up his eyes, being ashamed."

Luke xx., 20: "And they watched him and sent forth spies, who should feign themselves just men." "They," according to Luke, were the scribes and chief priests (v. 19), but both Matthew (xxii., 16) and Mark (xii., 13) with more definition state that they were Pharisees and Herodians. Calvin (*Harmony* on the passage) well notes that these two parties in the State held opposite views in regard to the paying of tribute. The one aimed at undermining Jesus' standing with the Many, should He admit the liability to tribute, and the other, should He deny it, could denounce Him to

the Dawlah. Neither of them could, therefore, have approached Jesus on such a question in their own proper characters, seeing that their views were well known; and Luke states that they, in fact, did not do so.

The only party who could, with any hope of being taken seriously, have put this question about the legitimacy of the census-money was that of the Sadducees. They were at once sticklers for the national law and upholders of the alien government (Jos., *Ant.* xiii., 10, 6: xviii., 1, 3, 4). The Hebrew for "Sadducees" in the writing of the period is not distinguishable from the word for "just" (*tsdukim* and *tsdikim*). In the present passage there does not seem to be much point in the emissaries of the Pharisees and Herodians "feigning themselves just men," and perhaps this "just" is merely a mistaken reading of an original "Sadducees." The Pharisees and Herodians give out that they are Sadducees. In the following section (Luke xx., 27) the real Sadducees appear in their own character.

Luke xxii., 26: "He that is greater among you, let him be as the younger" does not present a correct antithesis. The reason no doubt is that in Hebrew and Aramaic one word denotes "greater" and "elder," and one word also "less" and "younger." The saying would therefore naturally run either: He that is elder let him be as the

younger, or, He that is greater let him be as the less (Matthew xx., 26: Mark x., 43).

Luke xxiv., 2: "and they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre." This statement is remarkable because Luke has not yet said anything about a stone being placed at the entrance of the tomb. One of the main difficulties which lie in the narratives of the resurrection of Jesus is that, whereas some accounts would indicate that Jesus was first seen by some women (Matthew xxviii., 9: Mark xvi., 9: John xx., 14), St. Paul seems to imply that Jesus appeared first to Peter (I. Corinthians xv., 5). St. Paul, no doubt, had his information from St. Luke, in whose narrative the precedency of Peter is curiously suggested (xxiv., 34, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon"). This means, according to the Codex Bezae, that Peter was one of the two disciples going to Emmaus, or it refers to an earlier and unrecorded appearance. This is not, however, the only expression in the third Gospel which may have led St. Paul to suppose that Jesus appeared first of all to Peter, whether that Gospel were known to him in a written or, what is more likely, in an oral form. The above sentence (xxiv., 2) may have done the same. St. Paul certainly thought in Aramaic, even when he was writing or reading Greek. In Aramaic the word for "stone," *kipho,* is also the proper name Cephas, and the

root which means to "roll away" (*agal*) also means to "hasten." It is quite conceivable, therefore, that when this verse was repeated or shown to St. Paul, he may have understood it in the sense "and they found Cephas hastening from the sepulchre" (*Cf.* Matthew xxviii., 8: Mark xvi., 8: Luke xxiv., 37). This suggestion was made in *The Expository Times* for March, 1913, and was replied to in the May number by the two Scots ladies, Mrs. Lewis and the late Mrs. Gibson, but it is difficult to see how else any one, reading or hearing St. Luke's Gospel for the first time, and not being familiar with Matthew xxvii., 60: Mark xv., 46, where the setting of the stone is mentioned, could understand this verse, unless in the sense of "Peter hastening from the sepulchre."

John xii., 32: "and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." This and the following paragraph do not deal with any variant, as the examples occur in one Gospel only; but they are of importance as supporting the general thesis that our Greek Gospels are all to a greater or less extent translations from an original Aramaic Gospel. There is a traditional saying handed down among the Arabs that the best mode of speech is that which contains ambiguity or *double entendre,* and which gives the sense, not by means of a plain and direct statement, but through

covert hint or allusion. This figure of speech is of very common occurrence in the sayings of our Lord, most of all in those found in the fourth Gospel. A good example is what was said to Judas at the last supper, "That thou doest, do quickly." The words were spoken in the hearing of all, and they put their own interpretation on them; but Judas alone knew what their exact import was (John xiii., 27ff.). Other ambiguous expressions are, "I have meat to eat that ye known not of" (iv., 32): "it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs," and the repartee of the foreigner (Matthew xv., 26f.): "if I wash thee not, thou hast no part in me," where Peter's reply only shows how lacking he was in wit (John xiii., 8): "one thing is needful," Luke x., 42. At other times a word is used twice, each time in a different sense, "Let the dead bury their dead" (Matthew viii., 22). In the present passage there is no ambiguity in the Greek. In it the words mean what they mean in English, and they mean nothing more; and the author says they referred to the crucifixion (v. 33). But this was not the sense in which the people who heard understood them. They thought being "lifted up" was equivalent to perishing, the opposite of "abiding for ever." How did it come about that Jesus used the words in one sense, and the people understood them in another? The explanation is that in Hebrew and Aramaic, as in Latin, the words meaning "to lift

up" mean also "to take away." Verses in which they bear the latter sense are Isaiah lvii., 14: Micah ii., 2: Daniel ii., 35: viii., 11: Ezekiel xxi., 26 (31), etc. It was in this sense that Jesus' hearers understood Him to use the word; and they replied, "We have heard out of the Law that Messias abideth for ever, and how sayest thou then, The son of man must be taken away?" (v. 34). Jesus Himself, however, perhaps used the word meaning to "lift up" or "exalt," referring probably, not to His ascension, but to His final recognition as a prophet. Thus the *double entendre* which is lost in the Greek would be preserved by the Latin. In Arabic also the same word is used for "lift up," "take away," and "crucify."

John xiii., 10: "He that is bathed needeth not (save) to wash (his feet), but is clean every whit; and ye are clean, but not all." The point of this saying lies in this, that it contains two ambiguities, if not more. The word "clean" is used first in a literal or physical, and then in a metaphorical or moral sense; and the word "all" at the end is ambiguous, because it may mean "every whit," or it may mean "all of you," referring to the Twelve. The disciples took it, and any one would naturally take it, in the former sense. That is the most natural and obvious interpretation of the words. Jesus, however, meant it in the latter sense, as the writer is careful to point out in the following verse,

"for he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean." But the point to note is that this second ambiguity does not exist in the Greek text. There "all," πάντες, can only mean the disciples, in contrast to "every whit," ὅλοι, and the explanation of v. 11 is superfluous. If, however, the words were originally spoken in Aramaic or Hebrew, the ambiguity would be there, exactly as it is in English.

A further example of this liking for amphibology is the saying, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will build it up" (John ii., 19). This saying is not found in the other Gospels, but it was known to the authors of the first and second (Matthew xxvi., 61: xxvii., 40: Mark xiv., 58: xv., 29). This saying also contained a *double entendre*: the people understood it in one sense, and Jesus meant it in another. Moreover, the people were *meant* to misunderstand it. It is not enough to say that Jesus merely used the word "temple" in a metaphorical way. In order that the double meaning may stand, the word for "temple" must in the language used by the Jews actually have borne two senses. The Greek word ναός is in the LXX. the regular equivalent of the Hebrew and Aramaic *hekhal*. The original sense of this word is, as we learn from the Arabic, "something colossal," then "a large body," then "body" in general, and finally "a large building" or "temple." One might translate "destroy

this framework" (*Cf.* D. S. Margoliouth, *Chrestomathia Baidawiana,* note 589). Thus the pre-Islamic Arab poet, Irmu'l-Keis, describes the large "frame" of his horse; and similarly in "The Philosophical Treatises of the Ikhwan as-Safa or Brethren of Sincerity," in the tractate of Music; and often. That this is the true explanation of the text appears not only from the necessity of the case, but from the fact that the author is at pains to change the Greek word for temple from *ἱερόν*, used in verses 14 and 15, which never answers to the Hebrew *hekhal,* into *ναός*, which is its regular equivalent; and it is not without significance that this saying is omitted altogether by Luke, seeing that in its purely Greek dress it is quite unintelligible. The verb *λύειν*, in the sense of destroying a building, comes from Ezra v., 12, LXX. B; and *ἐγείρειν*, as the equivalent of the Hebrew *hekits* or *hekim,* could be used either of erecting a building or of raising the dead (Isaiah xxvi., 19). The saying of Jesus, indeed, seems to be a reminiscence and combination of the two passages just cited.

This note was communicated to *The Expository Times* for January, 1910 (vol. xxi., p. 191), and was met by Professor J. C. Ball in the March number with the objection that *hekhal* was derived from the Sumerian for "great house," but this does not affect the argument above, that the word had actually two meanings. Other instances of the

same figure in the fourth Gospel are:—iv., 35 (fields white to harvest): ix., 39 (that they which see not might see): xi., 23 (thy brother shall rise again); and on the part of the author, ii., 23, 24 (many believed on His name, but Jesus did not commit (same word as "believed") Himself to them); and there are no doubt more.

In all these instances of amphibology it is always the hidden meaning that is the real meaning, and the fact that this use of *double entendre* is a characteristic of the sayings of Jesus in all four Gospels goes a long way in support of the historical reliability of all four.

SUMMARY

WHEN we see the crowd of "various readings" upon one of the pages of a critical edition of the New Testament, such as that of Tischendorf or of Von Soden, we are apt to imagine that the text must be in a very corrupt state indeed, and to despair of ever being able to arrive at any text which will be satisfactory and generally acceptable. It is indeed a hard thing to find a single verse in the reported sayings of Jesus which agrees in two of the Gospels in every word and letter, though such verses do occur. But it is probable that the most of folk have a very exaggerated notion of the number of various readings in the

New Testament as a whole. Dr. Hort, at the beginning of the Introduction to the New Testament edited by himself and Bishop Westcott, points out that in regard to the great bulk of the words in the New Testament there is *no* variation or other ground of doubt. Even where various readings do occur, they are often of such a character that no one would think of inserting them in the text. Dr. Hort estimates the proportion of words in the New Testament accepted on all hands, and quite unquestioned, as, on a rough estimate, not less than seven-eighths of the whole. Setting aside differences of orthography and of the order of words and other trivialities, the words which, from his point of view, are still open to doubt make up about one-sixtieth of the whole. And even of this sixtieth, the proportion of variations which are of any substantial value can hardly be more than one-thousandth part of the whole text.

Dr. Hort goes on to say, "Had all intervening transcriptions [that is, between the author and the extant MS.] been perfectly accurate, there could be no error and no variation in existing documents. Where there is variation, there must be error in at least all variants but one."

This last statement would be true if we were sure we were dealing with original documents and their copies, but not necessarily otherwise. A number of Latin MSS. might contain versions made from the same Greek and differ widely from

one another, yet their variations would not be errors. And in the same way, if our Greek Gospels, or at least the first three of them, are, more or less, directly or indirectly, translations from an original Hebrew or Aramaic text, they might conceivably differ widely from one another, and yet all be correct. In this way even Dr. Hort's estimate of one in a thousand would be very considerably reduced.

The late Baron Von Soden, the latest editor of the New Testament text, considers that the disturbing element in the Gospels is the Diatessaron of Tatian. He thinks it possible to eliminate from the Gospels the readings due to the Diatessaron, which would take us back to about 140 A.D. And between this date and the original autographs various readings would hardly arise.

The purport of the foregoing lectures has been to show that the first three Gospels at any rate go back, as was declared by Papias and Irenæus, to an original Hebrew Gospel. Many of the variants in the Gospel reports simply mean that we have two witnesses to what this original text was, instead of one. The field is one which may be ploughed and ploughed again, and it will be many a day before the last relic of the past has been turned up. In the present ploughing but a few stones have been turned over. Much awaits the scholar whose ploughshare will make a deeper furrow. That must be left to abler hands.

UT

F V I V

V I V A S

A G

Weir
Variants in gospel reports

613367

OCT 27 '40	McCoy	
JAN 15 '42	Eric Titus	

613367